













# HISTORY OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

ADAPTED FROM THE FRENCH OF  
REV. P. F. GAZEAU, S.J.  
"

WITH REVIEW QUESTIONS ADDED.



2471

NEW YORK:  
THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY CO.,  
9 BARCLAY STREET.

1878.

Copyright, 1878, by  
THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY CO.

1118  
g28

H. J. HEWITT, PRINTER, 27 FOSE STREET, NEW YORK

# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE MIDDLE AGES, . . . . .	9
<i>FIRST EPOCH (595-604).</i>	
CHAPTER I.	
Great Invasions and fall of the Empire of the West (395-476), . . . . .	17
<i>Section 1.</i> Honorius (395-423)—Alaric and Radagaisius. <i>Sec.</i> 2.	
2. Valentinian III. (424-455)—Genseric and Attila. <i>Sec.</i> 3.	
Last Emperors and Confederates.	
CHAPTER II.	
Gaul—Ascendency of the Merovingian Franks, . . . . .	34
<i>Section 1.</i> Origin of the Franks—Clovis I. (481-511). <i>Sec.</i> 2.	
Wars and Conquests of the Successors of Clovis to the death of Dagobert I. (511-638).	
CHAPTER III.	
Great Britain—The Anglo-Saxons, . . . . .	41
CHAPTER IV.	
Spain—The Visigoths, . . . . .	45
CHAPTER V.	
Italy and the Eastern Empire, . . . . .	48
<i>Section 1.</i> Italy under the Heruli—Odoacer (476-493). <i>Sec.</i> 2.	
The Ostrogoths—Theodoric the Great and his Successors.	
<i>Sec.</i> 3. The Eastern Empire after Theodosius—Reign of Justinian (527-565)—Belisarius and Narses. <i>Sec.</i> 4. Lombards in Italy (568-774).	

## CHAPTER VI.

	PAGE
The Church and the Barbarians, . . . . .	63
<i>Section 1. The Church confronting Heresy. Sec. 2. Conversion of the Barbarians.</i>	

---

## SECOND EPOCH (604-814).

## CHAPTER I.

Ascendency of the Carlovingians, . . . . .	73
--	----

*Section 1. "Sluggard" Kings and Mayors of the Palace (638-752)—Pepin of Heristal and Charles Martel. Sec. 2. Pepin the Short (752-768) and Charlemagne (768-814)—Foundation of the Temporal Power of the Popes (755)—Restoration of the Western Empire (800).*

## CHAPTER II.

Mohammedanism—Arabian Empire, . . . . .	85
---	----

*Section 1. Mohammed (570-632) and the Koran. Sec. 2. Elective Caliphate (632-661)—Conquests of the Arabs. Sec. 3. Ommiades at Damascus (661-750). Sec. 4. Abbassides—Dismemberment of the Caliphate. Sec. 5. Arabian Civilization.*

## CHAPTER III.

The Eastern Empire in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries, . . . . .	109
---	-----

*Section 1. Heraclian Dynasty and Monothelism. Sec. 2. Isaurian Iconoclast Emperors.*

## CHAPTER IV.

The Church and Christian Civilization. . . . .	116
--	-----

**THIRD EPOCH (814-1073).****CHAPTER I.**

	PAGE
The Carlovingian Empire and Feudalism, . . . . .	122
<i>Section 1. Two Dismemberments of the Carlovingian Empire (843-888). Sec. 2. Feudal System in France and Europe Sec. 3. The last Carlovingians (888-987) and the first three Capetian Kings (987-1060).</i>	

**CHAPTER II.**

Invasions in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, . . . . .	138
<i>Section 1. Invasions of the Saracens and Hungarians. Sec. 2. Invasions of the Normans into Russia, England, and the Carlovingian Empire—Rollo and Normandy (911). Sec. 3. Conquests of the French Normans—Foundation of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies—William the Conqueror in England (1066).</i>	

**CHAPTER III.**

Germany and Italy, . . . . .	160
<i>Section 1. The Germanic Kingdom and Northern Races (888-962). Sec. 2. Italy and the Western Empire (888-962). Sec. 3. Western Empire transferred to the Kings of Germany (962). Sec. 4. Cis-Juran and Trans-Juran Burgundy—Kings of Arles (887-1032).</i>	

**CHAPTER IV.**

Spain, the Arabians, and Greeks, . . . . .	175
<i>Section 1. Vicissitudes of the Struggle between the Arabs and Christians of Spain. Sec. 2. Greek Empire—Photius and Michael Cerularius.</i>	

**CHAPTER V.**

The Church and Feudalism—Conversion of the Scandinavians and Slavs, . . . . .	184
<i>Section 1. Catholic Hierarchy, particularly in the Tenth Century—Desolations and Consolations. Sec. 2. Conversion of the Scandinavians. Sec. 3. Conversion of the Slavs.</i>	

*FOURTH EPOCH (1073-1270).*

## CHAPTER I.

PAGE	
Struggle of the Papacy and the Empire (1073-1250), . . . . .	200
<i>Section 1.</i> Investitures—St. Gregory VII. and Henry IV—Concordat of Worms (1073-1122). <i>Sec. 2.</i> The Popes confronted with the Hohenstaufens—Guelfs and Ghibelines—Independence of Italy—The Long Interregnum of the Empire (1137-1272).	

## CHAPTER II.

Crusades in the East, . . . . .	241
<i>Section 1.</i> First Crusade (1093-1099)—Power of Islamism and Weakness of the Eastern Empire—Godfrey of Bouillon, King of Jerusalem (1099)—The Knights Hospitalers and Templars. <i>Sec. 2.</i> Second Crusade (1147-1149)—Louis VII. and Conrad III—Third Crusade (1189-1193)—Frederick Barbarossa, Philip Augustus, and Richard Cœur de Lion—Teutonic Knights. <i>Sec. 3.</i> Fourth Crusade (1202-1204)—Foundation of the Latin Empire of Constantinople (1204-1261)—Fifth (1217-1221) and Sixth (1228) Crusades. <i>Sec. 4.</i> The Two Crusades of St. Louis—Results of the Crusades—Chivalry.	

## CHAPTER III.

The Crusades in Europe, . . . . .	278
<i>Section 1.</i> Crusades against the Moors of Spain. <i>Sec. 2.</i> Crusade against the Albigenses (1208-1229). <i>Sec. 3.</i> Crusades against the Pagans of the Baltic in the Thirteenth Century.	

## CHAPTER IV.

France and England, . . . . .	297
<i>Section 1.</i> Progress of Royalty in France—Emancipation of Cities. <i>Sec. 2.</i> England—The Norman Kings (1036-1154) and the first four Plantagenets (1154-1272)—Ireland before and after the Anglo-Norman Invasion (1171)—Magna Charta (1215).	

## CHAPTER V.

The Scandinavians, Slavs, and Mongols, . . . . .	330
<i>Section 1.</i> The Scandinavian Kingdoms. <i>Sec. 2.</i> The Slavonian States. <i>Sec. 3.</i> The Mongols and the Empire of Jenghis Khan.	

## CHAPTER VI.

	PAGE
The Two Great Epochs of the Mediæval Age, . . . . .	351
<i>Section 1.</i> Meridian of the Papacy and the Church—Religious Orders—Propagation and Vindication of Christianity. <i>Sec. 2.</i> Theological Sciences, National Languages, and Christian Art.	

---

*FIFTH EPOCH (1270–1453).*

## CHAPTER I.

Great Schism of the West, . . . . .	376
<i>Section 1.</i> Dispute of Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair—The Popes of Avignon (1305–1378). <i>Sec. 2.</i> The Great Schism (1378–1417)—Councils of Pisa (1409) and Constance (1414–1418)—The Ten Years' Schism (1439–1449)—Councils of Basle (1431–1439) and Florence (1438–1442)	

## CHAPTER II.

France and England—Hundred Years' War, . . . . .	399
<i>Section 1.</i> The last Capetians and the first three Valois (1270–1380)—Struggle of the three Edward Plantagenets (1272–1377) against France and Scotland. <i>Sec. 2.</i> Anarchy in England and France—Lancasters and Stuarts—Final Triumph of Charles VII.	

## CHAPTER III.

Germany, Switzerland, and Italy, . . . . .	420
<i>Section 1.</i> Germany—The three Imperial Families. <i>Sec. 2.</i> Liberation of Switzerland (1307–1450). <i>Sec. 3.</i> Italy—Struggle of Guelphs and Ghibelines—Republics transformed into Principalities.	

## CHAPTER IV.

Spain—The Five Kingdoms, . . . . .	443
------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER V.

Scandinavia and the Slavic Countries, . . . . .	453
<i>Section 1.</i> The three Scandinavian Kingdoms—Margaret (1363–1412) and the Union of Calmar. <i>Sec. 2.</i> Slavs in servitude, except the Poles and Hungarians.	

## CHAPTER VI.

	PAGE
The Greek Empire and the Ottoman Turks, . . . . .	464
<i>Section 1.</i> Conquests of the Ottoman Turks to the battle of An-gora, or Ancyra (1299-1402). <i>Sec. 2.</i> The Mongol Empire under Timur, or Tamerlane—The Ottoman Turks to the Taking of Constantinople (1402-1453).	
REVIEW QUESTIONS, . . . . .	480

---

## APPENDIX.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE, . . . . .	487
LIST OF ROMAN PONTIFFS, . . . . .	492
LIST OF MONARCHS, . . . . .	496

# HISTORY OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

### THE ROMAN EMPIRE, THE BARBARIANS, AND THE CHURCH IN 395.—THE FIVE EPOCHS OF MEDIÆVAL HISTORY.

WITH the death of Theodosius the Great in 395 begins the history of the Middle Ages. It is so called because it is a narration of the events which ended in the overthrow of the ancient civilized or Roman world, and laid the foundation of the principal states of modern times. Thus all agree in looking upon the Middle Ages as a period of transition, during which was brought about the union of three societies, the Roman Empire, the barbarian world, and the Church, that at the death of Theodosius stood in opposition to each other.

**The Empire.**—At the end of the fourth century the Roman Empire extended from the Atlantic Ocean to the banks of the Euphrates, and from Caledonia, the Rhine, and the Danube as far as the African deserts. This vast territory was divided into four prefectures, which again were subdivided into

fourteen dioceses and one hundred and eighteen provinces, comprising many municipalities.\*

The emperor, who had absolute power, governed with the help of ministers and civil and military officers. The principal of these officers were the prefect of the pretorium, the grand master of the horse, and the grand master of the infantry, in the prefecture; the vicar, or vice-prefect, the master of horse, and the master of infantry, in the diocese; the president, or proconsul, the duke, and the count, in the province; the curiales, or members of the curia, in the city.

This hierarchy, so regular and beautiful in appearance, contained in reality the germs of approaching dissolution. There was neither law nor sanctioned usage to regulate the order of succession to the throne. It was easy for officials to commit exactions in an empire too extensive for

\*The following is a summary of the principal divisions of the empire under Honorius:

WESTERN EMPIRE.						
<i>Prefecture of Italy :</i>						
Diocese of Western Illyria,	.	.	.	.	.	.
" Northern Italy,	.	.	.	.	.	.
" Rome,	.	.	.	.	.	.
" Africa,	.	.	.	.	.	.
						8 provinces.
						"
						7
						10
						4
						"
<i>Prefecture of the Gauls :</i>						
Diocese of Brittany,	.	.	.	.	.	.
" the Gauls,	.	.	.	.	.	.
" Spain,	.	.	.	.	.	.
						5
						18
						7
						"
Seven dioceses,	.	.	.	.	.	.
						59
						"
EASTERN EMPIRE.						
<i>Prefecture of the East :</i>						
Diocese of Egypt,	.	.	.	.	.	.
" the Orient,	.	.	.	.	.	.
" Asia Minor,	.	.	.	.	.	.
" Pontus,	.	.	.	.	.	.
" Thrace,	.	.	.	.	.	.
						6 provinces.
						"
						15
						10
						11
						6
						"
<i>Prefecture of Eastern Illyria :</i>						
Diocese of Dacia,	.	.	.	.	.	.
" Macedonia,	.	.	.	.	.	.
						5
						6
						"
Seven dioceses,	.	.	.	.	.	.
						59
						"

one chief to superintend its administration. The increase of taxes reduced the lower classes of the people to such want that the curiales, or principal citizens, who were held responsible to the state for the delinquency of the other taxpayers, renounced the honors of the curia to escape poverty. Patriotism had disappeared, either on account of imperial despotism or because the title of Roman citizen had been degraded by its being lavishly conferred on barbarians; and then it was difficult to unite in sympathy so many provinces widely differing in language, manners, and interests. Finally, a horde of barbarians had been brought into the empire to guard the frontiers, and were embodied with the legions under the name of "auxiliaries," or "federates." Thus the Roman Empire, with its oppressive administration, had neither citizens nor soldiers to be trusted for its defence.

**The Barbarian World; the Germans.**—At all the frontiers the empire was harassed by barbarians: in the island of Britain by the fierce clans of Caledonia; on the Euphrates by the warlike nation of the Persians; and at the south, by the nomadic tribes of the desert, among whom appeared the Arabs, destined later to act so important a part. At the end of the fourth century there was serious danger only at the north of the empire in the vast countries which extend beyond the Rhine and the Danube. The Romans divided this territory beyond the Rhine and the Danube into three distinct regions, inhabited by three great families of barbarians: Germany as far as the Vistula and the Baltic Sea; Sarmatia to the Rha (Volga); and Scythia, which comprised all the northeastern part of Europe

and the whole of Asia, between the Volga and the Black Sea.

The Germans, or “men of war,” became formidable to the Romans after the destruction of the legions of Varus, and were extended from south to north in numerous tribes, some isolated, others united into confederations. The principal of these tribes were the Franks (Saliens, Ripuarians, Sicambrians, etc.), Allemanni, Suevi, Bavarians, Burgundians, Frisians, Saxons, Angles, Vandals, Heruli, Lombards, Danes, Scandinavians, and finally the Goths, who extended their sway over nearly the whole of Sarmatia. This nation, long the most powerful of all Germany, was divided into three distinct races: the Ostrogoths, or Eastern Goths, on the left shore of the Borysthenes (Dnieper); the Visigoths, or Western Goths, on the right shore of the same river; and the Gepidæ, or laggards, who remained behind near the sources of the Vistula.

The Germans, the future conquerors of the empire, were distinguished from the Romans by their personal appearance, their character, and their national institutions. They were robust and of lofty stature, with fair complexion and blue eyes; they were clad in short and scant garments, some having besides a close-fitting linen tunic, others deer or sheep skins, and all wore cloth or leather trousers reaching to the feet. The most prominent trait in their character was the love of independence and warfare. To gratify their wandering propensity they took care not to build cities and villages, but lived in huts of wood or earth, which were scattered throughout the plains and forests. The soil was held in common; every year it was divided into as many portions as there

were families. These barbarians considered it a disgrace to till the land, and left its care to their slaves. They loved war and the chase. The bravest were accompanied by a certain number of retainers, voluntarily bound to conquer or to die in their service on condition of sharing the booty. Before setting out on a campaign they chose the most courageous warrior as supreme chief. This dignity, wholly temporary, could be bestowed upon the king of the nation, as is evident from the usage of the Franks and Goths. But the sovereign authority principally resided in the assembly of freemen, which regulated all important political or judicial affairs. We shall see later that the Germans, even after settling in the empire, preserved their national institutions; but their gross idolatry soon vanished before the light of the Gospel. Their supreme god was Tuisco, or Teutsch, the father of the Germanic race, from whom the Germans derive the name of Teutons. They worshipped the earth (Hertha), the sun, the moon, and the thunder; but their favorite god was Odin, who presided over war, gave them victory, and at night indulged his warlike propensity by tilting in the air with the brave who had been slain fighting. Such a god promised the living a paradise agreeable to their tastes; this was Walhalla, his own residence, where heroic combats every day resulted in glorious wounds, which were healed at night and soon forgotten in the revels of a banquet where warriors drank hydromel from the skulls of their enemies. It is easy to understand what impulse such a prospect lent the ferocious conquerors of the Roman Empire.

**Slavs and Scythians; Origin of the Great Invasions (376).**—The Sarmatians, or Slavs, for the most

part subject to the Goths, then to the Huns, were afterwards divided into Southern Slavs (Bosnians, Servians, Croatians, Slavonians, Dalmatians), Western Slavs (Moravians, Czechs or Bohemians, Lusatians, Wiltzes, Pomeranians, Poles), and Northern Slavs (Prussians, Lithuanians, Livonians, Estonians, and Roxolani). The latter, mingled with the Fins, have formed in great part the Russian nation.

The Scythian race, called also the Turanian or Tartar, comprised the Fins, the Alans, and the Huns, who were already in Europe. The Avari, the Bulgarians, the Magyars or Hungarians, the Mongols or Tartars, and the Turks were still in Asia, subject to the Huns.

The arrival of the Huns in Europe, in 376, was the beginning of the great invasions. These barbarous hordes, having set out from the frontiers of China, and being joined by the Alans, who dwelt at the north of the Caucasus, struck the vast empire of the Goths, which stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea. The Ostrogoths, or Eastern Goths, were crushed by the innumerable Tartar cavalry, and Hermanrich, their king, an old man of a hundred years, slew himself with his own sword rather than survive his defeat. The Visigoths, seized with fear, evacuated the country west of the Borysthenes and fled towards the Danube. Then the Huns, drawing the Ostrogoths and the Gepidae along with them, spread throughout the neighboring countries, overcoming the peaceable Sarmatians without difficulty, and driving ahead the warlike tribes of Germany, who, impelled from north to south, were dashed upon the frontiers of the Roman Empire like so many swollen and irresistible torrents.

The Visigoths, having reached the Danube, obtained leave to cross the river and settle in Mœsia, a province of the Eastern Empire. The Emperor Valens, although forced to give them an asylum, stipulated that they should embrace Arianism and deliver up their arms. These barbarians found it less distasteful to become heretics than to become harmless, for they contrived to keep their arms and soon took occasion to use them. To avenge the exactions of the imperial officers they laid waste the country with fire and sword. The Emperor Valens, hoping to rid the empire of these dangerous guests, attacked them under the walls of Adrianople; but his army was cut to pieces, and the hut to which he had fled for shelter being set on fire by the conquerors, he perished in the flames (378).

Theodosius, chosen to succeed him, avenged his defeat and compelled the Visigoths to return to Mœsia. The barbarians reluctantly submitted to live there in peace during the reign of the great emperor, until the favorable occasion came for the first invasion of the empire.

**The Church.**—Triumphant over persecution and heresy, the Church overthrew the idols and took possession of the Roman Empire. But the empire was about to disappear, as, in helping to spread Christianity, it had fulfilled its mission. The Church, which had the promise of everlasting life, was destined to survive the empire and to form a new world. With no other arms than persuasion and the power of virtue she met the shock of invasion, tamed the wildness of the barbarians, solaced the woes of the Romans, and brought conquerors and conquered together under the sweet yoke of the Gospel. This work

of reparation she accomplished by proclaiming the equality and brotherhood of all men in the sight of God, the sacred rights of slaves, the dignity of the Christian family, and the duty of succoring the unfortunate. She opened her temples as so many inviolable asylums, and she distributed to the poor the treasures which she had from the bounty of princes and of the faithful. Her powerful hierarchy alone remained unbroken and presented its different grades, from the humblest minister of the altar to the bishop, elected defender of the city to protect the weak, and alike devoted to the welfare of the people. The emperor no longer resided at Rome, where the successor of St. Peter was gladly obeyed and was generally independent.

**The Five Epochs of the Middle Ages.**—The history of the Middle Ages begins with the death of Theodosius the Great (395), and ends at the taking of Constantinople by the Turks (1453). It is divided into five epochs:

1. *The Invasion and Conversion of the Barbarians*, from the death of Theodosius the Great to the death of St. Gregory the Great (395–604).

2. *The Formation of Christian Europe*, from the death of St. Gregory the Great to the death of Charlemagne (604–814).

3. *Feudal Europe*, from the death of Charlemagne to the accession of St. Gregory VII. (814–1073).

4. *The Papacy and the Christian Republic*, from the accession of St. Gregory VII. to the death of St. Louis (1073–1270).

5. *Religious and Political Anarchy*, from the death of St. Louis to the taking of Constantinople by the Turks (1270–1453).

## FIRST EPOCH (395-604),

*FROM THE DEATH OF THEODOSIUS THE GREAT  
TO THE DEATH OF ST. GREGORY THE GREAT  
—209 YEARS.*

The first epoch of the mediæval age comprised the invasions and the conversion of the barbarians. After invading and dismembering the Western Empire the Germans occupied the whole territory and founded several kingdoms : the Franks in Gaul, the Anglo-Saxons in England, the Visigoths in Spain, and finally the Heruli in Italy, afterwards succeeded in turn by the Ostrogoths, the Greeks, and the Lombards. At the death of St. Gregory all the Germanic tribes in the empire had embraced the true faith.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### THE GREAT INVASIONS AND THE FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE (395-476).

The Western Empire in the space of eighty-one years sustained the shock of six great invasions, three under the Emperor Honorius and as many under Valentinian III. The empire was already dismembered when the city of Rome, sacked by Genseric, was left to the mercy of the barbarians, who abolished the imperial dignity.

#### Sec. 1. *Honorius (395-423) ; Alaric and Radagaisus.*

DIVISION OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE (395).—Theodosius the Great, to ensure the defence of the empire, had divided it between his two sons, Arcadius, who received the Eastern Empire, and Honorius, the Western. The princes, being still too young to govern, were under the tutelage of two ministers,

who were jealous of each other and ready to sacrifice the interests of the empire to their own ambitious projects. Stilicho, a Vandal by birth, ruled in the name of Honorius, and Rufinus the Gaul in the name of Arcadius. The first had merited his high rank by his brilliant services, the second had elevated himself by intrigue. It was a time of confusion, when every case was decided by arms, and Stilicho resolved to supplant his rival and alone govern the two empires. His aim became evident by his refusing to divide the imperial treasure and to dismiss the Eastern legions at Constantinople. Rufinus, terrified by the threatening danger, resolved to avert it at the expense of the empire ; he therefore secretly instigated the Visigoths to ravage all the country up to the very walls of Constantinople. His design was to secure the alliance of that warlike people against Stilicho, and to strengthen his credit with Arcadius by proving that he alone was able to save the Eastern capital. Thus was the perfidious minister about to offer the barbarians what they had sought for twenty years—a favorable opportunity to penetrate into the heart of the empire and devote it to plunder.

#### **ALARIC RAVAGES THE EASTERN EMPIRE (395–396).**

—The Visigoths, having leave as auxiliaries to settle in Moesia, had displayed their courage and fidelity under Theodosius the Great. But their new chief, Alaric, of an illustrious family, eagerly answered the summons of Rufinus. Aware of the weakness of the empire, he ravaged the fairest provinces with fire and sword, and boldly advanced to the very walls of Constantinople. This was the first time that the barbarians had appeared before the gates of the capital.

Their savage aspect, as well as the falling of their arrows into the city, brought consternation to its inhabitants. Rufinus alone, gratified in his desires, arrogantly asserted there was nothing to fear and that he would save the state. Invested with the insignia of a general, he hastened to Alaric, whom he induced to depart from Constantinople on the payment of a large sum and full liberty to pillage the rest of Greece.

Two hundred thousand Visigoths, with wagons carrying their wives and children, fell like a devastating scourge upon the rich provinces, till then closed to the barbarians. At the first summons the degenerate Greeks abandoned the pass of Thermopylæ; Athens was saved by payment of a ransom, Corinth was destroyed, and the Peloponnesus laid waste. In vain did Stilicho hasten with all the forces of the empire to encounter the terrible Alaric; he was at once compelled to send back the Eastern legions to Constantinople, and they departed full of rage, vowed vengeance against the unworthy rival. At the very moment that Rufinus, seated beside the emperor at a solemn review, was hoping to obtain the title of Cæsar, a soldier suddenly approached the haughty minister, and, striking him with his sword, cried out: "There, take this stroke in the name of Stilicho!"

Stilicho found it easier to rid himself of a rival than to save the empire. Having hemmed in Alaric on Mount Pholoe, he imprudently let him escape, and soon after learned that the Emperor Arcadius, changing his minister without changing his policy, had just granted to a barbarian chief, as a reward for his ravages, a dignity till then reserved for the greatest services. Alaric was named commander of the militia in the Illyrian prefecture (396).

FIRST INVASION ; ALARIC IN ITALY (401-403).—Alaric, having taken the title of King of the Visigoths, maintained that a heavenly voice summoned him beyond the Alps. The first to dare invade the Western Empire, he came down upon the fertile plains of Italy and marched against Milan, which Honorius had made his capital. Stilicho, arriving in great haste, was able only to rescue the emperor and conduct him to Ravenna, thenceforth made the imperial residence, because it was considered impregnable by land and sea. To deliver Italy from the barbarians, Stilicho decided to give battle on Easter day (402) under the walls of Pollentia (Piedmont). The Catholic soldiers, marching to battle armed with the sign of the cross, decided the victory. Alaric lost the flower of his army, as well as his wife, his children, and all his treasures. Vanquished a second time near Verona, he consented to return to Illyria, while the Emperor Honorius, with the astute Stilicho at his side, entered Rome in triumph. In the midst of the games of the circus, celebrated in honor of the deliverance of Italy, a poor monk named Telemachus entered the arena, knelt down among the gladiators, and besought the people to give up so inhuman an amusement. The irritated spectators stoned him to death, but the blood of the martyr was more persuasive than his words, and Rome abolished the gladiatorial combats for ever.

SECOND INVASION, CALLED THE GREAT INVASION OF 406 ; RADAGASIUS IN ITALY.—Italy, barely delivered from the Visigoths, was menaced by a still more formidable invasion. The German barbarians, fleeing before the Huns, continued to pour down towards the Danube and the foot of the Alps.

Two hundred thousand descended the valley of the Adige under the command of Radagaisus, who vowed to immolate thousands of victims to his divinities, thirsting, he said, for human blood. All Italy was terror-stricken ; the pagans, who were still numerous, clamored for the re-establishment of the ancient sacrifices to appease the gods of Rome. But the Christians confidently invoked the true God, and an apparition of St. Ambrose, Archbishop of Milan, gave the Florentines courage to prolong resistance. Stilicho, having assembled thirty legions, freed Florence, drove the barbarians to the rocks of Fiesole, and compelled them to lay down their arms. Radagaisus was beheaded, and his comrades sold in the market as common slaves. Stilicho received for the second time the glorious title of Liberator of Italy.

THE GREAT INVASION IN GAUL (406-409).—The disaster of Radagaisus terrified the barbarians who remained on the Danube. About four hundred thousand Vandals, Alans, Suevi, and Burgundians turned their backs upon Italy to cast themselves upon Gaul. Having crushed the Ripuarian Franks and the Germans, who guarded the river, they crossed it on the ice during the last night of the year 406. These ferocious hordes sacked Mayence, Strassburg, Metz, Rheims, and most of the other cities of Gaul. The ruin of the country, says a contemporary, would not have been more complete had the entire ocean swept over the plains of Gaul.

The Emperor Honorius, uneasy for Italy, left the provinces open to the barbarians. The Roman legions that he had recalled from Britain protested against abandoning that fair province and proclaimed a simple officer named Constantine as emperor (407). The

new emperor was acknowledged first by the inhabitants of Gaul and afterwards by Honorius himself. He had promised to be the liberator of Gaul ; but the barbarians, after ravaging it for two years, departed less through fear than from a desire to seek richer booty elsewhere. The Vandals, the Suevi, and the Alans, crossing the Pyrenees (409), threw themselves upon Spain, which till then had been spared the evils of invasion.

**THIRD INVASION ; ALARIC IN ITALY (408-410).**— Alaric, encamped at the approaches to Italy, threatened to unite with the other barbarians in a final blow at the very heart of the empire. Stilicho, to deter him, promised to cede him the prefecture of Illyria. The minister, it is said, wished to gain a powerful auxiliary against the barbarian invaders of Gaul ; but he was accused, not without grounds, of consulting his personal interests. Being the father-in-law of the Emperor Honorius, who had no children, he hoped to secure the throne for his own son, Eucherius, a pagan like himself, and supported by the confederates, or barbarians in the pay of the empire. Honorius, alarmed at these criminal projects, signed the death-warrant of Stilicho, who was beheaded on the threshold of a church in Ravenna where he had sought an asylum (408). Many thousands of confederates were involved in the same massacre, but those who escaped found an avenger in Alaric.

Alaric, crossing the Alps a second time, marched straight upon Rome. “God urges me on,” he replied to a hermit who vainly tried to hinder him. The Romans, besieged and suffering from famine, consulted the pagan oracles ; they only hastened thereby the chastisement of their city, which Heaven

purged from idolatry to render it worthy of becoming the capital of Christendom. When the Roman deputies tried to intimidate Alaric by representing to him the great number of the inhabitants—upwards of twelve hundred thousand—“So much the better,” said he; “the thicker the grass, the easier to mow it.” After threatening the besieged to spare nothing but their lives, the haughty conqueror contented himself with imposing a ransom of five thousand pounds of gold and thirty thousand pounds of silver (409).

Honorius, shut up in Ravenna, refused to ratify the treaty, and Alaric appeared under the walls of Rome for a second time. The barbaric king amused himself by creating a man named Attalus emperor, but deposed him at the end of a few days as a useless toy. Exasperated by the perfidy of Honorius, who responded to new advances by an unexpected attack, he besieged Rome a third time, entered it under cover of the night, and gave it up for six days to all the horrors that could be inflicted by his barbarous followers (410). This proud city, so long mistress of the world, had not sustained such a disaster since Brennus the Gaul, eight centuries before, had reduced it to ashes. The Visigoths, by order of their king, destroyed all that came in their way. Only the inhabitants who had sought shelter in the churches of St. Peter and of St. Paul were spared. Fire was joined to pillage, and, as if Heaven itself desired to render the chastisement more signal, the lightning threw down several pagan temples and crumbled the senseless idols before which impious adorers were prostrate. Amidst these ruins the true religion gloriously arose;

the precious vases belonging to the church of St. Peter were restored by the awe-struck conquerors themselves. The Christians hastened from all quarters, and mingling with the barbarians, and singing hymns, formed a kind of military procession which augured the approaching triumph of the faith destined to unite all nations in the worship of the true God.

Alaric, laden with the spoils of Rome, proceeded towards the south of Italy, designing, it is said, to conquer Sicily and Africa. But death overtook him at Cosenza. The Visigoths, wishing to bury him with divers precious articles in the bed of the river, employed the prisoners to turn aside its course during the night, after which they strangled them to a man to ensure secrecy, and to protect from profanation the tomb where they laid the conqueror of Rome (410).

**THE VISIGOTHS IN GAUL AND SPAIN (412-419).**—Ataulf, the brother-in-law and successor of Alaric, at first resolved to found a Gothic empire on the ruins of that of Rome. But he soon gave up the plan to enter the service of the Emperor Honorius, who commissioned him to bring back Gaul and Spain into subjection. The usurper Constantine, besieged in Arles and taken prisoner by Constantius the general (411), had many imitators who were not more fortunate; Ataulf overthrew them, and was finally enabled to come to Narbonne, and there solemnly espouse the virtuous Placidia, the sister of Honorius, who had become his captive at the sack of Rome. As a wedding present the barbarian chief offered her the most costly of the booty brought from Italy. The nuptial ceremonies afforded another memorable in-

stance of the vicissitudes of fortune : Attalus, the mock emperor of Alaric's whim, was appointed to direct the choir that sang hymns in honor of the royal pair.

Ataulf, having pacified Gaul, began his operations in Spain, but was assassinated at Barcelona (415). Wallia, his successor, carried on his projects against the barbarians ; he utterly exterminated the Alans, drove back the Suevi into Galicia and the Vandals into Bætica, which was called by their name, Andalusia (*Vandalitia*).

In return for his services Wallia obtained from Honorius the south of Gaul as far as the Garonne, which he joined to his conquests in Spain to form the kingdom of the Visigeths, of which Toulouse became the capital (419). At the same epoch the Emperor of the West consented to acknowledge the kingdom of the Suevi in Galicia. Six years before (413) he had ceded to Gundicarius, King of the Burgundians, the valleys of the Saone and the Rhone, where was then founded the kingdom of the Burgundians. In the year 409 he had officially renounced the island of Britain and acknowledged the independence of the Armorican cities between the Seine and the Loire ; so that at the death of the weak Honorius (423) the empire of the West was already dismembered and comprised but a part of Gaul with Africa and Italy.

**Sec. 2. Valentinian III. (424-455); Genseric and Attila; Fourth Invasion; the Vandals in Africa (429).**

Valentinian III., nephew and successor of Honorius, was born of the last marriage of Placidia with

the general and patrician, Constantius. As he was yet a minor his mother held the reins of government. This princess, whose wisdom equalled her virtue, had given her confidence to two generals well qualified to save the empire had they but agreed. But Aëtius, master-general of the horse, entertained a secret jealousy of Boniface, the governor of Africa. To rid himself of his rival he accused him of rebellion against Placidia, who recalled him to the court, and at the same time he secretly sent him word that if he left Africa to justify himself his death would be certain. Boniface, too honorable to suspect such perfidy, nevertheless committed the fault of defending his innocence by the very crime of which he was accused : he unfurled the standard of revolt and summoned the Vandals into Africa.

The king of these barbarians at that time was the ambitious and cruel Genseric (428–477), who hastened to cross the strait of Gades (Gibraltar). Scarcely had the Vandals landed in Africa than they spread fire and slaughter throughout Mauritania (429). “The whole district,” says a contemporary, “was depopulated and ravaged ; they uprooted vines and cut down trees, so that the inhabitants, who had sheltered themselves in the caves and inaccessible mountains, might not be able to find sustenance on their return. They wreaked unheard-of refinements of cruelty on their prisoners to force them to give up their treasures. The feebleness of age and of sex, rank, nobility, the sanctity of the priesthood, failed to assuage their fury. When they came to a fortified place which their undisciplined troops could not reduce, they would assemble a great number of prisoners and put them to the sword, so that the

stench of their corpses, which they left unburied, might force the garrison to abandon the place."

Count Boniface, who had detected the treachery of Aëtius, in vain performed prodigies of valor to check these ferocious invaders ; he was vanquished, and obliged to shut himself up in Hippo, which surrendered after a siege of fourteen months (431), made illustrious by the devotedness and death of the bishop, St. Augustine. Genseric, the declared enemy of Catholicity, being reinforced by the heretics, extended his ravages throughout Roman Africa, so famous for its fertility that it was called the granary of Rome and of the human race. The opulence of the inhabitants was equalled only by their wickedness ; so that the calamities that befell them were looked upon as the effect of divine vengeance. It is affirmed that the Vandals destroyed five millions of people, and turned Africa into a desert where a traveller might journey several days without meeting a living soul.

Finally, Genseric seized Carthage and made it his capital (439). His maritime power soon became as formidable as that of the ancient Carthaginians ; he took possession of the Balearic isles, Corsica, Sardinia, and a part of Sicily ; he devastated the Italian coasts, and menaced even Constantinople. One day his pilot, on leaving the port of Carthage, asked whither he should sail. " Towards those whom God desires to chastise," replied Genseric ; " turn thy prow to the wind—all coasts are ours."

**FIFTH INVASION; ATTILA IN GAUL (450-451).**—Though Count Boniface had obtained Placidia's pardon, he was unable to appease the hatred of his rival, Aëtius, who sought the aid of the Huns against him. This time, however, victory declared itself for the

right; but Boniface perished in consequence of a wound received in the battle. Aëtius, restored to favor, thought only of wiping out his faults by the splendor of his exploits against the barbarians. Victorious over the Burgundians and Visigoths, he turned his arms against the Franks of Clodion, drove them towards the Scheldt (447), and restored the imperial authority throughout nearly the whole of Gaul. Genseric, perceiving himself menaced in Africa, thought to evoke the storm by drawing the most terrible of scourges upon the empire.

The Huns had been ravaging Europe for more than half a century when Attila, having become their sole king (433-453), extended his conquests from the Baltic Sea to the frontiers of China. This barbarian seemed born to affright the world and to bear the thunderbolts of divine wrath to the ends of the earth; he styled himself the Scourge of God. "The grass grows not," said he, "where my steed has passed." His appearance was the index of his ferocity: his head was enormously large, his eyes small and sparkling, his nose flat, his complexion swarthy, his step haughty and threatening. Such was this chief, worthy to command warriors who carried their enemies' heads at the pommels of their saddles.

At the instigation of Genseric, Attila at first invaded the Eastern Empire, and destroyed more than sixty important cities. The weak emperor Theodosius II. consented to pay him tribute; but his successor, Marcian, upon being summoned to follow his example, made this haughty reply: "I have gold for my friends, but steel for my enemies." Whether the king of the Huns was intimidated, or hoped for

richer booty in the West, or was called thither by Honoria, the sister of Valentinian III., he turned his back to the East and set out towards Gaul. Followed by 500,000 warriors, this ferocious conqueror crossed the Rhine, sacked Metz, Rheims, and the other cities on his way ; but he spared Troyes in consideration of its bishop, St. Lupus ; and to the prayers of an humble virgin, St. Genevieve, Paris owed its escape from his fury. He was about to give up the city of Orleans to pillage when St. Aignan, its bishop, who watched and prayed for his people, announced the arrival of the Roman general. Aëtius hastened at the head of his legions, which were reinforced by the Franks, Visigoths, and a multitude of other barbarian warriors. Attila, for the first time forced to withdraw, halted on the vast plain of Chalons-sur-Marne. There took place a terrible conflict between the two largest armies Europe had ever beheld in battle array. The Visigoths lost their king, Theodoric, but they shared with the Franks the glory of deciding the victory over the savage invaders. Attila, foaming with rage, entered his camp and entrenched himself behind his wagons. He raised an immense funeral pyre of horse-trappings, intending to perish in the flames in case of defeat. Aëtius, however, deemed it prudent not to drive so formidable an enemy to despair, and allowed him to recross the Rhine (451).

SIXTH INVASION ; ATTILA IN ITALY (452).—Attila burned to revenge his defeat on Italy ; he ravaged the southern part of it from Aquileia, which he reduced to ashes, to Milan, which he set up for ransom. On his approach, the terror-stricken inhabitants of Venetia sought refuge in the islands of the Adriatic,

where they founded the city of Venice, destined to become the Queen of the Adriatic. The emperor, Valentinian III., thinking himself no longer secure in Ravenna, fled to Rome. As he could not rely on Aëtius, whose fidelity was distrusted, and as the army was insufficient, he sent to the barbarian king an embassy headed by Pope St. Leo the Great. The imposing aspect of the sovereign pontiff, who seemed armed with irresistible power, intimidated the conqueror; he agreed, upon being paid a considerable sum, to go out of Italy, but threatened to return the following year unless half the empire was ceded to him with the hand of Honoria, whose ring he had received as a marriage pledge.

Attila did not return; he fell in a drunken fit in an entrenched camp, which served him as a capital on the banks of the Theiss (453). The Huns gave him worthy obsequies. "They cut off their hair," says an historian of the time, "and furrowed their hideous faces with deep gashes, because to mourn such a warrior the blood of men, not the lamentations of women, was meet." They laid out the body of Attila under a silken tent in the open plain. It was an imposing and solemn spectacle. The most skilful horsemen galloped around it as if in the circus. At the same time they vaunted the exploits of the King of the Huns in a funeral chant: "Attila, son of Munzuck, chief of the most valiant nations gathered under his sway, the mighty people of Scythia and Germany; he struck terror into the empires of the East and of the West by taking many cities; the others he spared only for entreaties and the payment of an annual tribute." His body was enclosed in a triple coffin of gold, silver, and iron, and was buried

at night with the richest spoils of conquered nations ; this done, the slaves who had dug the trench were killed, and the orgies of a banquet concluded the funeral ceremonies. With Attila disappeared the vast empire which he had founded. The Huns, weakened by civil war, dispersed. The races they had subjugated, whether Slavs or Germans, recovered their independence and formed distinct states, the most powerful of which were the kingdom of the Gepidæ, on the left bank of the Theiss, and that of the Ostrogoths in Pannonia.

The Emperor Valentinian III., having nothing further to fear from the Huns, was eager to rid himself of the only general who could boast of having vanquished them. Either through jealousy or a desire of preventing a conspiracy, he summoned Aëtius to his palace and murdered him with his own hand (454). Some months later he was himself assassinated by order of the senator Petronius Maximus, whom he had insulted. With him ended the family of Theodosius the Great, and thenceforth in the West the imperial dignity lost the prestige it had enjoyed among the barbarians during the great invasions.

### Sec. 3.—The Last Emperors and the Confederates.

SACKING OF ROME BY GENSERIC (455).—The murderer of Valentinian III., not content with usurping his crown, married his widow, Eudoxia, by force. The latter called upon the king of the Vandals to help her break the bonds of a marriage that she abhorred. Genseric eagerly seized the opportunity of securing rich booty. At his approach, Maximus, as cowardly as he was cruel, attempted to flee

from Rome, but the indignant people stoned him to death. Pope St. Leo, who had succeeded in disarming Attila, vainly endeavored to stay Genseric at the gates of Rome ; the barbarian would promise nothing except to spare the city from fire and sword, but he maintained the right of delivering it up to pillage. For fourteen days and nights the Vandals continued to despoil Rome with that destructive rage which has made their name so infamous. They spared nothing that the Visigoths had respected ; they loaded ships with gold, silver, and masterpieces of art, sacred vessels taken from churches, and even the bronze that covered the Capitol. They carried away 60,000 captives, among whom were Eudoxia and her children. Carthage, on beholding the fleet sail into her harbor laden with the spoils of Rome, might well think herself avenged on a rival that had formerly condemned her to utter destruction.

**RICIMER AND ODOACER.**—Rome, humbled and depopulated by the Vandals, became the sport and prey of the barbarians, who disputed the privilege of appointing its emperors. The charge fell to those who, under the denomination of confederates, were then cantoned in Italy. Ricimer, of the Suevi, their commander, for upwards of sixteen years disposed at pleasure of the imperial purple. Thrice it was left to his option to assume it, but he preferred to see it upon his creatures, whom he could as easily cast down as exalt. In twenty years eight emperors either perished or were deposed.\* Several of them, especially Majorian and Anthemius, were men of moral

\* The eight emperors were : Avitus, 455-456, successor of Petronius Maximus ; Majorian, 456-461 ; Severus, 461-467 ; Anthemius, 467-472 ; Olybrius, 472 ; Glycerius, 473-474 ; Julius Nepos, 474-475 ; Romulus Augustulus, 476.

qualities and military talents. But they committed what was in the eyes of Ricimer the unpardonable fault of wishing to be real monarchs.

At the death of Ricimer (472) a former secretary of Attila, named Orestes, also made use of the confederates to dispose of the purple. Having refused the title of emperor for himself, he gave it to his own son, then a child, who, by a strange coupling of the names of the founder of Rome and of the empire, was called Romulus Augustulus. He was the last and the weakest of the Western emperors. The confederates, being masters of Italy, established themselves there as the barbarians had done in the other provinces of the empire. Most conspicuous amongst their chiefs was a certain Odoacer, by birth of the Heruli, who relied on his courage and cunning to verify a singular prophecy. One day, as he was going to Italy as a simple soldier, he went out of his way to pay a visit to St. Severinus, the celebrated apostle of Noricum. Being tall, he had to stoop in order to enter the humble cell of the hermit, who advised him to pursue his journey, and said, "Thou art great, but thou shalt be still greater." Odoacer, who had never forgotten this saying of the holy prophet, seized the opportunity of rising to a loftier station by demanding, in the name of the confederates, the third part of the lands of Italy. A refusal served as a pretext to attack the patrician Orestes, who was seized and slain in Pavia (476). Romulus Augustulus was required to abdicate, with the assent of the Roman senate. Reduced to a private station, he deemed himself fortunate in receiving an annuity and leave to end his days in peace in an elegant villa of Campania.

Odoacer, proclaimed king, sent a solemn embassy to Zeno, Emperor of the East, with instructions to surrender to him the insignia of the imperial dignity and to acknowledge his supremacy. Zeno, flattered to learn that according to the judgment of the Roman senators there was now but one empire, of which he was the sole master, thought it politic to let Odoacer retain the title of king with the government of Italy. Thus ended the Empire of the West (476). It had lasted 507 years from the battle of Actium and 1,229 years from the foundation of Rome. As it had already lost all the provinces beyond Italy, its extinction was scarcely remarked. It was like the death of an old man who, gradually losing his strength and the use of his limbs, retains but a spark of life till he almost imperceptibly breathes his last.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### GAUL.—PREPONDERANCE OF THE MEROVINGIAN FRANKS.

Of all the states formed by the barbarians on the ruins of the Roman Empire none equalled in power that of the Merovingian Franks, founded by Clovis, and extended by his sons and grandsons till the death of Dagobert I.

**Sec. 1. Origin of the Franks.—*Clovis I. (481–511).***

**THE FRANKS BEFORE CLOVIS.**—The name of Franks, which appears for the first time in history in the middle of the third century, was applied to a confederation of German tribes between the Rhine

and the Weser. The Franks—that is, free or daring men—soon rendered themselves formidable to the Romans by their frequent incursions into the territory of Gaul. Always vanquished, and yet always ready to renew their attacks, they were the first of the barbarians who obtained permission to settle in the empire. The most powerful of their tribes, the Salians, originally from the source of the Sala (Yssel), occupied Toxandria (Brabant) on the banks of the Meuse (358). Other Franks, known as the Ripuarians, were commissioned to defend the banks of the Rhine against the barbarians of Germany. Crushed by the great invasion of 406, they soon gave up the part of auxiliaries of the empire, and seized the opportunity to take possession of the northern part of Gaul.

In 428 the king of the Franks was Clodion, who, several historians assert, was the son of Pharamond, and who at least belonged to a family sufficiently illustrious to furnish kings to the tribe of the Salians. Clodion seized Tournai and penetrated as far as the environs of Sens (448); but he was surprised and vanquished there by Aëtius. His successor, Merovæus, appears to have lived in alliance with the Romans, since he assisted them against the terrible Attila (451). He left his petty kingdom to his son Chiladeric, who is known less by the events of his reign than by the honor of being the father of Clovis.

CLOVIS (481-511); FOUNDATION OF THE MONARCHY OF THE FRANKS.—Clovis, proclaimed king at the age of sixteen, soon formed the project of conquering Gaul, which was divided among several hostile tribes. The Franks occupied all the north of the country, from the Somme to the Rhine; at

the east the Germans, or Allemanni, dwelt between the Rhine and the Vosges ; the Burgundians between the Saone, the Rhone, and the Alps ; the Visigoths had conquered all the south of Gaul as far as the Loire ; to the west were the Bretons, recently arrived from the island of Britain, the confederation of the Armorican cities, and a colony of Saxons settled at Bayeux ; finally, in the countries situated between the Loire and the Somme, Syagrius ruled over those Gallo-Romans who still survived the fall of the Western Empire.

Clovis, setting out from Tournai, marched speedily against Syagrius, whom he defeated near Soissons (486). This victory enabled him to take possession of nearly all the country as far as the Loire. His marriage (493) with Clotilda, a Catholic princess, brought him the possession of several cities which he had not been able to obtain by force of arms. Nothing was wanting to the youthful conqueror but the light of the Gospel to guide him. God granted him this grace in the heat of a desperate battle which he was waging with the Allemanni on the plain of Tolbiac (496). Clovis, seeing his troops give way before the enemy, promised that if he was victorious he would adore no other god than the God of Clotilda. His victory was so complete that he was able to pursue the enemy beyond the Rhine, and impose tribute on the Allemanni and Bavarians.

Clovis, true to his promise, had himself and his best warriors instructed in the Catholic religion, and he was solemnly baptized by St. Remi, Bishop of Rheims (496). He was then the sole Catholic prince in the world ; the Franks were the first of the barbarians to renounce their idols and embrace the

true faith. Clovis, congratulated by the Sovereign Pontiff and the bishops of Gaul, beheld the Bretons and the Armoric cities joyfully submit to his sway. He had, however, to employ force of arms against the Burgundians and the Visigoths, who were Arians and jealous of the Franks. The Burgundian king was Gundobald, who had murdered his brothers, one of whom was Clotilda's father. Clovis avenged his consort by defeating Gundobald near Dijon and imposing on him an annual tribute (500). The Visigoths sustained a defeat still more complete at Vouillé, or Voglode; they lost their king, Alaric, the flower of their warriors, and all Aquitania (507). They had lost all their possessions in Gaul except the sea-coast between the Rhone and the Pyrenees, thenceforth called Gothland, or Septimanca. Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, under pretext of aiding the Visigoths, obtained of them the title of king, and drove the Franks from Provence, which he added to his states.

Clovis, on his return from his brilliant expedition, received from Anastasius, Emperor of the East, the title and insignia of patrician and consul, which secured to him, in the eyes of his new subjects, the legal possession of all his conquests. His zeal for religion contributed to enforce his authority, and he had become the mightiest monarch in Europe when he died at Paris, his capital (511).

## Sec. 2. Wars and Conquests of the Successors of Clovis till the Death of Dagobert I. (511-638).

THE FOUR SONS OF CLOVIS.—The inheritance of Clovis was apportioned among his four sons: Thierry resided at Metz, Clodomir at Orleans, Childebert at Paris, and Clotaire I. at Soissons. Their mother,

Clotilda, induced the three latter to unite their arms against the King of the Burgundians, Sigismund, eldest son and successor of Gundobald. Sigismund was made prisoner and drowned in a well by order of Clodomir, who soon expiated this act of cruelty. After gaining a victory near Veseronce (524) he fell into the hands of the Burgundians, who put him to death. He left three minor children, two of whom were murdered by their uncles Childebert and Clotaire, while the youngest escaped and was later celebrated for his virtues under the name of St. Cloud.

Gondemar, the brother and successor of Sigismund, withstood for ten years the attacks of the Franks, but at last succumbed, and the kingdom of the Burgundians lost its independence (534). Thierry, King of Austrasia, had already conquered Thuringia (530). Theodebert (534–548), his son and successor, was the most active and enterprising of the Merovingians after Clovis. Having obtained Provence in return for the aid that he had promised to the Greeks and Ostrogoths, he defeated them in turn in Italy and devastated the whole country (539). Exasperated against the Emperor Justinian, who had had the vanity to assume the title of Franciscus, he himself took that of Augustus, and had determined to carry the war to the very walls of Constantinople when he died by an accident. Under his son Theodebald, the Austrasian Franks made a second expedition into Italy; but nearly all perished either by the plague or the sword of the Greeks.

On the other hand, Childebert and Clotaire, in compliance with the request of their sister Clotilda, who was ill-treated by her husband, Amalric, King of the Visigoths, had undertaken an expedition into

Spain, whence they returned with rich booty. Thus, after some years, the Franks were not only masters of Gaul, but extended their conquests or their influence beyond the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees. Clotaire I., having become sole king (558–561), enjoyed his formidable power but three years.

SONS AND GRANDSONS OF CLOTAIRE I.; RIVALRY OF NEUSTRIA AND AUSTRASIA (568–613).—At the death of Clotaire I. the monarchy was again divided among his four sons: Caribert, King of Paris; Gontran, of Orleans and Burgundy; Chilperic, of Soissons; and Sigebert, of Metz. Instead of enlarging their territory by conquests, the sons of Clotaire thought only of turning their arms against one another and of repelling the incursions of the Lombards, the new masters of Italy, and of the Avari, who had settled on the Danube.

After the death of Caribert civil war broke out in consequence of the assassination of Galsuinde, the wife of Chilperic. Brunehaut, sister of the victim, roused the vengeance of her consort Sigebert. The cruel Fredegunda, who had reaped the fruit of her crime by ascending the throne, induced Chilperic to make a sudden invasion into Austrasia. Sigebert, not content with repelling it, in turn invaded his brother's kingdom of Neustria. He was already master of Paris and acknowledged King of Neustria, when two villains, instigated by Fredegunda, pierced his heart with poisoned daggers (575).

Sigebert left as heir a son, yet a minor, who was proclaimed King of Austrasia under the name of Childebert II. His uncle Gontran took him under his protection, and strengthened this alliance by the treaty of Andelot (587), which secured to the lords

the life possession of their benefices. But Fredegunda having added to several other murders that of her husband, caused her son to be proclaimed king of Neustria under the name of Clotaire II. (584), and made preparations for war against Brunehaut. The implacable hatred of these two women only awaited the death of the pacific Gontran to engage anew in deadly conflict (593). Fredegunda first defeated Childebert near Droissy, then his two sons, Theodebert and Thierry, at Latofao, and at last died in the midst of success (597). Brunehaut, freed from her rival, once more attacked Neustria, and was about to crush Clotaire II., when the defection of one of her grandsons and the death of the other left her defenceless against Clotaire, who held her accountable for all the horrors of the civil war, and caused her to be dragged to death at the tail of a wild horse (613).

CLOTAIRE II. AND DAGOBERT I. (613–638).—Clotaire II., already King of Neustria, became sole master of all the empire of the Franks (613). His triumph seemed to be that of Neustria over Austrasia, of royalty over the aristocracy of the prelates and lords; but the prince weakened the royal authority by a famous *constitution*, published at Paris (615), which left to the Austrasian lords the election of the *mayors of the palace* and to the clergy the choice of the prelates.

Dagobert I. (628–638), the eldest son and successor of Clotaire, made his reign illustrious by his wisdom and magnificence, and by the influence he exerted throughout the West. He surpassed all his predecessors in the splendor of his court, which he had fixed at Paris. Surrounded by richly-apparelled offi-

cers, the monarch sat upon a throne of massive gold, made by St. Eloi, the most skilful goldsmith of his time. A multitude of ambassadors, among whom were those of the Emperor of the East, came to solicit the alliance and friendship of a sovereign who had no equal in Europe. His sway extended from the Pyrenees to the Weser, and from the ocean to the frontiers of Bohemia. On the death of his brother, Caribert, he annexed Aquitania to his states. He had for tributaries the Bavarians, Allemani, Frisians, Thuringians, and the Saxons; he gave orders to the Lombards in Italy, and he set a king over the Visigoths in Spain. His generals subdued the Vascons, the descendants of the Iberians, who had invaded that part of Aquitania called by their name, Gascony. Finally the Britons themselves consented to pay homage in the person of their king, Judicaël. This holy man, thinking more of virtue than of power, preferred, when at court, to dine at the table of the Chancellor St. Ouen, who was the friend of St. Eloi. Dagobert, before his death, was obliged to name his eldest son king of Austrasia, and he lived long enough to see decline set in upon the Merovingian monarchy, soon represented by the “sluggard” (*fainéant*) kings under the tutelage of the mayors of the palace.

---

## CHAPTER III.

### GREAT BRITAIN.—THE ANGLO-SAXONS.

THE ISLAND OF BRITAIN BEFORE THE INVASION.—The island of Britain, at first called Albion, from the lofty chalk cliffs of its shores, received its name

from the Britons, a Celtic people from Gaul. It was visited by Julius Cæsar. In the following century the Romans conquered all but the northern part, called Caledonia. Two Caledonian tribes, the Picts (painted) and the Scots, not content with resisting the attacks of the Romans, disturbed them in their conquests by frequent incursions. To keep these barbarians in their own country, three great walls were built at different times, extending across the whole width of the island. The Britons became so accustomed to depend upon the Roman legions in their wars with the northern barbarians, that when the Emperor Honorius left them to their own resources (407), they made a pathetic appeal to Rome, which, under the name of the "Groans of the Britons," has been preserved to us. "We know not," said they, "whither to turn; the barbarians drive us to the sea, and the sea drives us back to the barbarians. Our only alternative is either to be swallowed up in the billows or to perish by the sword."

The emperor, menaced in Italy, turned a deaf ear to the complaints of so remote a province. The Britons in vain strove to repel their formidable enemies. Vortigern, their head chief, called in the assistance of German pirates (449).

INVASION OF THE SAXONS AND ANGLES; THE HEPTARCHY (449-584).—1,500 of these pirates, led by two brothers, Hengist and Horsa, landed on the isle of Thanet. They came from the banks of the Elbe and belonged to the confederation of *Saxons* (long-knived men). Vortigern promised to cede the island where they had landed if they succeeded in repelling the Picts and Scots (449). The pirates, reinforced by a great number of their countrymen,

easily defeated the Caledonians ; but they yielded to the very natural temptation of occupying not only the isle of Thanet, but also the neighboring coast of Kent. Having thenceforth become the enemies of the Britons and the allies of the Picts, they remained masters of the country between the lower Thames and the English Channel. Hengist founded the kingdom of Kent, of which Canterbury became the capital (455).

This success attracted other Saxons, who overcame the resistance of the natives and eventually founded the three kingdoms of Sussex, or South Saxony (capital, Chichester, 491), Wessex, or West Saxony (capital, Winchester, 516), and Essex, or East Saxony (capital, London, 526).

The Angles, who dwelt in the centre of the Cimbrian peninsula, followed the example of the Saxons. Led on by the terrible Idda, surnamed the *Firebrand*, they landed on the eastern coast. After a deadly struggle with the Britons they founded the three kingdoms of Northumberland (capital, York, 547), East Anglia (capital, Norwich, 571), and Mercia, that is, the *marches* or military frontiers (capital, Lincoln, 584).

The seven kingdoms founded by the two nations, and therefore denominated the *Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy*, were at first independent of each other. They afterwards formed a confederation under a supreme chief (*Bretwalda*), who presided over a general assembly or *Wittenagemct* (council of the wise). Yet the Heptarchy was weakened by intestine dissensions and an unceasing conflict with the Britons.

The Britons had opposed an energetic resistance

to the invaders. More than once their standard of the red dragon had prevailed over the Saxons' white dragon. They were animated by an implacable hatred of the conquerors who, after having laid waste their native soil, appropriated it to themselves. No province of the empire suffered so much from the invasion of the barbarians. Some of the ancient inhabitants were reduced to slavery; others were compelled to seek safety in Armorica, called after them (Bretagne) Brittany; the greater number retreated to the western mountains of their island and there founded three states—Cumberland, Cornwall, and Wales. The kingdoms of Cumberland and Cornwall soon lost their independence (607 and 750), but the warlike inhabitants of Wales prolonged their resistance until the reign of Edward I. (1283).

**CONVERSION OF THE ANGLO-SAXONS (597).**—The island of Britain was converted to the Catholic faith in the second century. St. Alban, the first martyr of Britain, died for the faith during the persecution of Diocletian (303). Religion was beginning to flourish when it disappeared, with civilization, under the blows of the barbarians. The Anglo-Saxons were pagans, addicted to the sanguinary worship of Odin. They butchered priests and bishops, razed sacred edifices, and thus plunged the country again into the darkness of heathenism. God inflamed the heart of an apostle with the desire of repairing so great an evil. One day as the deacon Gregory was walking in the streets of Rome he remarked the beauty of some youthful slaves set up for sale, and asked their name and nation. On being told that they were English or Angles (Latin *Angli*), he exclaimed, “They are angels rather than Angles” (*Angli quasi angeli*),

and he resolved to become a missionary to Great Britain. But, hindered in his design by the Romans, who elected him pope, St. Gregory the Great sent forty missionaries to the land of the Angles, thenceforth called England (Angleland). The monk Augustine, or Austin, and his fellow-laborers landed on the isle of Thanet, as the fierce conquerors of the country had formerly done. Though their mission was wholly pacific, it alarmed Ethelbert, the King of Kent and the supreme chief of the Heptarchy. But he heeded the counsels of his pious wife, Bertha, a daughter of Caribert, King of Paris. As he feared some magic spell if he remained under the same roof with the strangers, he received them at first under an oak-tree in the open country. St. Augustine easily dispelled his groundless fears, and obtained leave to proceed to Canterbury. Thither he repaired in a procession with the other missionaries, preceded by a cross and singing psalms. The effect of his preaching was that the king and ten thousand of the Saxons received baptism. St. Augustine was named Archbishop of Canterbury, and commissioned by the Sovereign Pontiff to re-establish the Catholic hierarchy and to evangelize the whole country.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### **SPAIN.—THE VISIGOTHS.**

THE POWER OF THE VISIGOTHS IN GAUL AND SPAIN (419–507).—The kingdom of the Visigoths, founded by Wallia (419), comprised Spain and the south of Gaul as far as the Garonne. In the fifth

century it was the most powerful of all the states formed by the barbarians out of the ruins of the Roman Empire. Theodoric I., the successor of Wallia, fell gloriously fighting at the battle of Chalons-sur-Marne (451). Three of his sons who succeeded him in turn on the throne, Thorismond, Theodoric II., and Euric, completed the subjugation of Spain, and extended their possessions in Gaul to the Loire and the Alps. They embellished their court with a refinement and a luxury unknown to the other barbarians. We can judge of the influence they exerted by the account of St. Apollinaris Sidonius, who visited King Euric at Toulouse. "The whole world," says he, "appeals to you and awaits your decision. Here is seen the blue-eyed Saxon, bold in war, ill at ease when ashore; here the veteran Sicambrian, shorn after defeat, cultivates his locks anew. Here struts one of the Heruli of almost sea-green hue; there the giant Burgundian bends his knee and sues for peace. Here the Ostrogoth seeks the patronage wherein lies his strength; and thou, too, O Roman! art not too proud to beg for thy life, and when the North threatens to fall upon thee, thou askest the arm of Euric to shield thee against the hordes of Scythia; thou prayest the mighty Garonne to harbor the enfeebled Tiber."

It might be supposed that the Visigoths, having become so formidable in the eyes of the Romans and even of the barbarians, would one day rule the surrounding nations; but we have seen how Alaric II., the son and successor of Euric, was vanquished near Voglade by King Clovis (507), who left the Visigoths no other possession in Gaul than that part of the sea-coast called after their name, Gothland, or Septimanica.

CONVERSION OF THE VISIGOTHS (587).—What especially contributed to the weakness of the Visigoths was their adherence to Arianism while the surrounding populations remained Catholic. The young Amalric, having espoused Clotilda, the daughter of Clovis, was less touched by her virtues than irritated by her dislike of Arianism, and he treated her with such brutality that she sent to her brothers a handkerchief stained with her blood as a witness of her suffering. Clotaire and Childebert, in order to avenge their sister, crossed the Pyrenees. Amalric lost the battle and his life. With him ended the illustrious family of Alaric (531). The crown then seeking a wearer was warmly disputed. Athanagild, to secure it for himself, called the Greeks into Spain and bestowed the hands of his two daughters, Brunehaut and Galsuinde, on the kings of Austrasia and Neustria. But the crown soon passed to a king of another family, who strengthened the rule of the Visigoths by his conquests and led to their conversion by his fanatical hatred of the true faith.

Leovigild (569–586) drove out the Greeks and subdued (585) the Suevi, who had, one hundred and sixty-six years previously, founded an independent kingdom in Galicia. This people, converted to Catholicity in the year 562, had exasperated the king of the Visigoths by harboring his son, Hermenegild, who had lately abjured Arianism. The young prince owed his conversion to the prayers of his wife, Ingonda, daughter of Brunehaut. His father having cast him into prison, promised to restore him to liberty and to all his rights as heir to the crown if he consented to receive communion at the hands of an Arian bishop. Hermenegild refused to consent to so

unworthy a proposal. King Leovigild, beside himself with rage, ordered his son to be beheaded. The martyr's blood soon bore its fruits. His brother, Recared, had scarcely ascended the throne when he solemnly abjured Arianism, and was followed by the greater number of the Visigoths (587).

The wisdom of Recared and the zeal of St. Leander, Archbishop of Seville, soon completed the extirpation of heresy. The inhabitants of Spain were now united in the same faith, and would have long enjoyed so precious a benefit had they been worthy; but the looseness of their morals, against which the Councils of Toledo protested in vain, drew upon them the most terrible chastisement. Messengers of divine vengeance from the African coasts were destined in one fatal day to annihilate the power of the Visigoths (711).

---

## CHAPTER V.

### ITALY AND THE EASTERN EMPIRE.

After the fall of the Western Empire Italy passed successively, in less than a century (476-568), under the rule of four nations—the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, the Greeks, and the Lombards. Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, in vain attempted to re-establish the Empire of the West; the Emperor Justinian was scarcely more successful, although, in the eyes of the barbarians, the emperors of the East had still the right to a certain supremacy as successors of the Roman emperors.

#### Sec. 1. Italy under the Heruli; *Odoacer* (476-493).

Rome and Italy, having so long swayed the world, were, more than any other of the provinces, destined to excite the vengeance or the cupidity of the barbarians.

Odoacer of the Heruli, having abolished even the very title of emperor, resolved to establish his dominion there. His first care was to concede by his own authority what the feeble Romulus Augustulus had refused : he distributed among the Heruli and the other barbarian confederates, who had proclaimed him king, the third of the lands in all Italy. The confusion of the times may extenuate so unjust and tyrannical a measure. A certain number of domains were at that time unclaimed and uncultivated. Odoacer, moreover, knew how to maintain peace in Italy and to direct the warlike tendencies of the confederates towards the frontier. He carried his victorious arms from the city of Ravenna, where he had fixed his court, to the shores of the Danube. Rome, so often humbled, witnessed with pride the triumph of this barbarian king, who left her the senate and her ancient constitutions. Even the clergy were the objects of unusual regard. Odoacer, though an Arian and the ruler of a pagan people, felt the influence of the true religion and the admirable virtues which it alone can produce. Full of veneration and gratitude for St. Severinus, who had predicted his astonishing rise, he declared himself ready to grant the saint whatever he wished. The holy apostle of Noricum asked for the pardon of a supporter of Romulus Augustulus, and then, it is said, with a prophetic glance piercing the veil of the future, he announced that after thirteen years the new king of Italy would come to an unhappy end. Thirteen years later the emperor of the East sent the Ostrogoths to destroy the domination of the Heruli in Italy.

**Sec. 2. The Ostrogoths; Theodoric the Great and his Successors.**

DEFEAT AND DEATH OF ODOACER (489-493).—The Ostrogoths, established in Pannonia since the dispersion of the Huns, were united under the command of one chief, who belonged to the illustrious family of the Amales. Theodoric, bred at the court of Constantinople, had learned to admire Byzantine civilization, although he retained the vices of a barbarian. Playing the empire's ally or enemy, as best suited his interests, his services had won him the titles of patrician and consul, and his ravages had terrified the city of Constantinople. The Emperor Zeno, to rid himself of so dangerous a neighbor, ceded him all his rights over Italy, in the hope that he would acknowledge his suzerainty.

Theodoric soon called his Goths together. Two hundred thousand warriors, followed by the old men, the women and children, opened the way to the nation through the mountainous routes of northern Italy. A victory in the Isonzo, and a second, still more bloody, near Verona, routed Odoacer and seemed to secure Italy to the conqueror. But in Liguria he met a resistance that could not be overcome until the arrival of a body of Visigoths sent by Alaric II. By this aid Theodoric was enabled to resume the offensive. Completely beaten on the Adige, the king of the Heruli was reduced to defend himself in Ravenna, the blockade of which lasted three years. Rome, however, and the rest of Italy submitted to Theodoric. The latter, to effect the surrender of Ravenna, which he wished to make his capital, promised his rival to share with him the government

of Italy. To this Odoacer assented. Six days after, in the midst of a grand banquet given by Theodoric, a signal was given : the Goths fell upon the Heruli and massacred them, while their king with his own hand murdered Odoacer and his young son. At the same time similar atrocities were committed in all the houses of Ravenna and the neighboring cities (March 5, 493).

REIGN AND INSTITUTIONS OF THEODORIC.—From that time Theodoric assumed the undisputed title of King of the Goths and Romans, till the time came when he was pleased to proclaim himself King of Italy, though his empire even then was no longer limited to Italy, subdued by arms, nor to Sicily, ceded by the King of the Vandals, but reached beyond the Alps to the Theiss, the Upper Danube, and the Rhone. He governed even Southern Gaul and Spain, as guardian of his grandson Amalric. Through family ties,\* by treaties or by victories, Theodoric succeeded in acquiring supremacy over the kings of the west without serious opposition from the emperors Anastasius and Justin.

After the conquest, a third of the lands and slaves was assigned to the Goths, with the obligation, however, of paying the taxes as the Romans did. These revenues were employed in building palaces, restoring ancient monuments, in games and shows, and in fitting out a fleet to protect the coasts. Theodoric had a love of the arts, favored letters, and reanimated the

\*Theodoric, whose wife was a sister of Clovis, gave his own sister in marriage to Thrasamond, King of the Vandals, his niece to Hermanfrid, King of the Thuringians, one of his daughters to Sigismond, King of the Burgundians, another to Alaric II., King of the Visigoths, reserving the youngest, Amalasonthe, for Eutharius, a prince of the Amales, who was to succeed him.

eloquence of the bar. He maintained the Roman legislation and judicial procedure throughout his provinces ; he extended its prescriptions even to the Goths, by the famous edict that bears his name, with the sole clause that at the trial of a Goth a count of his nation should preside at the court, with Romans for *assessors*. At the same time he expressly forbade the Goths to study jurisprudence and literature, or to frequent the schools. "To the Romans belong the arts of peace, to the Goths those of war," said Theodoric. In fact, the Goths alone entered the army.

**THEODORIC CEASES TO BE NEUTRAL AND BECOMES A PERSECUTOR.**—In the meanwhile Theodoric had been very impartial in regard to Catholicity. He refused to join the Emperor Anastasius in legislating about dogmas, and exerted himself to bring about the union between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople ; he abolished the law of Odoacer, which made the election of the popes subject to the approval of princes ; he declared for Pope Symmachus against his crafty competitor. Fervent Catholics, such as the patricians Festus, Symmachus, and Boëthius, enjoyed his favor ; Cassiodorus was his secretary ; bishops, as St. Epiphanius and Ennodius of Pavia, exercised a great and salutary influence over him.

Unfortunately these good qualities did not continue to the end. The accession to the empire of the Catholic Justin I. (518) attracted attention to Constantinople. Theodoric took umbrage at this, and he gave ear to informers. One of his first victims was the illustrious Boethius, guilty of wishing to shield one of his friends and of daring to expostulate with

Theodoric. He was imprisoned, then horribly tortured by rack and rods, till his eyes started from their sockets. At last he was beheaded, with his father-in-law, Symmachus. Theodoric claimed the right of persecuting the Catholics throughout his states, and of protecting his co-religionists in the East, from whom Justin had withdrawn the privilege of public worship. Pope John I., who declined to advise Justin favorably to the Arian heresy, was seized by order of Theodoric and thrown into the dungeons of Ravenna, where he soon died from privation. The king survived him but three months, during which time he was harrowed by remorse, uneasiness, and forebodings (526).

Theodoric by many historians is surnamed the Great, nor could this title be denied him were it possible to forget his conduct towards Odoacer, Symmachus, Boëthius, and Pope St. John I.

SUCCESSORS OF THEODORIC.—Theodoric was succeeded by his grandson, Athalaric; whose mother, Amalasonthe, a most accomplished woman, ruled with great firmness, in accord with the emperors of the East. But the Goths, who were still barbarians, were desirous of educating their young king after the manner of their ancestors. The princess then raised her cousin Theodotus to the throne with herself. This nephew of the great Theodoric was thoroughly accomplished, but he was as avaricious as a barbarian and as dastardly as a degenerate Roman. He imprisoned and strangled his benefactress, despite the tears of the Italians and the remonstrances of the emperor of the East (535). This emperor was Justinian, whose generals, Belisarius and Narses, were to rid Italy of the Ostrogoths, notwithstanding the

courageous efforts of Vitiges and Totila, worthy successors of Theodoric.

**Sec. 3. The Eastern Empire after Theodosius ;  
Reign of Justinian (527-565) ; Belisarius and  
Narses.**

**THEODOSIAN DYNASTY.**—The reign of Arcadius, eldest son of Theodosius, worthily begins the history of the emperors of Constantinople. For ten centuries and a half cowardice, sloth, or cruelty characterized all but five or six princes; low intrigues and shameful adulations, the subjects; culpable support was given to heresy and schism; there was a rapid and nearly always bloody succession of emperors and dynasties, and a gradual diminution of imperial possessions and individual resources. And this was the period of what is fitly known as the *Lower Empire*.

In speaking of the invasions we have given the external history of Arcadius. Let us add that this prince disliked to appear in public, and the only energy that his wife the Empress Eudoxia showed was in taking revenge on the eloquent archbishop, St. John Chrysostom. If the weak Theodosius II., son of Arcadius, enjoyed some years of calm during his long reign, celebrated for the promulgation of a code and the holding of the great councils of Ephesus, he was indebted to his sister St. Pulcheria. This noble princess, who succeeded to the power on the death of Theodosius, rendered great service to the Church and the state by associating with herself the virtuous Marcian, who was equally capable of repelling Attila and condemning Eutyches. With him expired the dynasty of Theodosius the Great (457).

**THRACIAN DYNASTY.**—Leo I., a mere tribune of Thracian birth, was elected to succeed Marcian through the exertions of the patrician Aspar. A zealous Catholic, Leo was the first prince that received the crown from the hands of a Pontiff. Having caused his frontiers to be respected, he attempted to avert the ruin of the West by attacking the Vandals of Africa ; but it was in vain, perhaps through the fault of Aspar, an Alan by nation and an Arian by religion. Leo caused him to be cruelly murdered by his father-in-law, Zeno. Zeno afterwards seized the reins of the empire, first as regent, at the death of Leo I., then as emperor, at the death of Leo II., his own son, who reigned less than a year. The reign of Zeno, interrupted one year by the usurpation of Basiliscus, was prolonged amidst the factions of the circus, the disturbances of the people crushed under the load of taxes, and by storms excited by a so-called decree of union (*henaticon*), which the emperor wished to impose upon consciences. Scarcely any attention was paid to the final dissolution of the Empire of the West. To Zeno, by means of an intrigue of the palace, succeeded Anastasius, then sixty years of age, who had never drawn the sword, though obliged to defend the empire against the Scenitic Arabs, the Bulgarians, and especially against Cabad, King of Persia, whom Anastasius succeeded in disarming with gold. This cowardly old man strenuously upheld the heresy of Eutyches during his reign of twenty-seven years (491–518).

**THE JUSTINIAN DYNASTY.**—Raised to the throne by the soldiers under his command, Justin I., though seventy years of age, and unable to read or write,

restored Catholicity throughout the East, and made the king of Persia tremble on his throne. He adopted his nephew Justinian, who succeeded him in 527.

**REIGN OF JUSTINIAN (527–565).**—Notwithstanding the odious recollections that his name awakens, Justinian is one of the imposing figures of history. Victories, public works, jurisprudence, are his titles to immortality which cannot be denied, even when we remember the severe censures, well-founded accusations, and the revolutions of the hippodrome, which almost deprived him of the empire.

**WAR AGAINST THE VANDALS; BELISARIUS.**—Hilderic, fifth King of the Vandals, had restored peace to the Church of Africa, when he was dethroned by Gelimer, who renewed the persecution. Justinian sent the famous Belisarius against the usurper (534). On landing in Africa, the Roman general by a victory threw open the gates of Carthage, defeated anew and took Gelimer at Tricameron; then, having restored all Africa to the allegiance of the Empire, he returned triumphant, laden with the spoils of the nations pillaged by the Vandals, and followed by a captive king. Belisarius was honored with the consulate. This dignity, the last vestige of the ancient Roman Republic, was about to disappear for ever.

**WAR AGAINST THE OSTROGOths; BELISARIUS AND NARSES.**—The African expedition had lasted but nine months. The war declared in 534 by Justinian against the Ostrogoths of Italy was to last twenty years. Belisarius, the victor of Africa, appeared in Sicily, then in Italy, where he took Rhegium and Naples (536). Unworthy of commanding the Goths, Theodatus was deposed and replaced by Vitiges, who had him put to death. The

new king tried to conciliate the esteem of the Italians and the good will of the Franks, but Belisarius continued to advance, subduing Italy and taking possession of Rome. The siege of this city by Vitiges inflicted on the inhabitants a whole year of unspeakable evils. Belisarius heroically defended himself with a handful of soldiers against 150,000 Goths ; he was, however, guilty of exiling Pope St. Silverius. The plague alone forced Vitiges to raise the siege. The same scourge fell likewise upon the army of Austrasian Franks, who were pouring into Italy to enrich themselves at the expense of the Romans and Ostrogoths. Belisarius then deemed himself strong enough to besiege Ravenna. Vitiges capitulated and was brought by his conqueror to Constantinople (540.)

While Belisarius, at the head of the Eastern army, painfully battled against the Persians, who were plundering Syria under their king, Khosroes I., the Ostrogoths of Italy were again forming their battalions under the standards of two ephemeral kings, soon replaced by the valiant Totila. For ten years this king prolonged the existence of Gothic power. Belisarius himself, on returning to Italy, obtained but trivial success and asked to be recalled. It was reserved to Narses to put an end to the Goths. At the head of an army of barbarians he gained (July, 552) the bloody victory of Tagina, which was followed by the death of Totila. Teias prolonged the struggle in vain ; he held out two days near Vesuvius, but was finally slain. Narses freely permitted the remnants of the Ostrogoths to recross the Alps. An army of Austrasian Franks having arrived too late to aid Teias, ravaged the country, but being

decimated by disease, was crushed by Narses near Casilin. Thus Italy was restored to the allegiance of the empire. Narses was its first exarch (554).

POLICY OF JUSTINIAN.—These conquests of the empire in the West were completed by the submission of Sardinia, Corsica, the Balearic Isles, and Southern Spain. But Justinian did not sufficiently distrust the Lombards that he had introduced into Pannonia; for they were more to be apprehended than the Gepidae whom they opposed. The northern frontier was as little respected by these savage guards as it was by their recent allies, the Avari, and their hideous rivals of the lower Danube, the Bulgarians. In vain Justinian erected citadels and strongholds in the provinces; they were but monuments of the empire's weakness. Another proof of its decline was the disgraceful treaty concluded with Khosroes, by which Justinian bound himself to pay the Persians an annual tribute of 30,000 pieces of gold. By such a tribute was the eastern frontier of the empire restored to tranquillity.

The sacred and profane edifices erected by Justinian attest his munificence. The church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, now a mosque, still excites admiration.

JUSTINIAN AND THE ROMAN LAW.—The greatest glory of Justinian, however, lies in the monuments of jurisprudence which he undertook or directed. His aim was to transform the ancient pagan law into a legislation less changeable, more equitable, and at the same time to render it Christian. In the beginning of his reign he assembled the most learned civilians of his time; at their head he placed Tribonian, Theophilus, and Dorotheus. Naturally

affable, frugal, and enterprising, he set himself actively to work at this gigantic but useful labor. In six years appeared : 1, the “Digest,” or Pandects, an abridgment in fifty books of more than two thousand treatises on law, as laid down by the Roman jurisconsults of the first three centuries of the Empire, Ulpian, Paulus, Gaius Papinian, etc. ; 2, the “Institutes,” an elementary work on law, to serve both as a manual for students at Rome, Constantinople, and Berytus, and as a text-book for professors and judges ; 3, the “New Code,” containing, in the same order as the “Digest,” the unrepealed constitutions of preceding emperors. From the publication of the code till his death, Justinian continued to promulgate a number of laws or constitutions ; they were compiled in a fourth book, under the title of “Novellæ.” Such is the Body of the Roman Law (*Corpus juris Romani*) as it has been taught from the sixth century to our own day. It is also known as the Civil Law. The emperor died (565) after a reign of thirty-eight years : a long duration compared with that of other reigns in the Lower Empire. Eight months before died the great general, Belisarius : not deprived of sight, nor reduced to beggary, as some have believed, but continually exposed to suspicions and envy, and weighed down by domestic griefs. Justinian too often allowed himself to be embittered against this remarkable man by Theodora, his unworthy wife, or by the criminal Antonina, whom Belisarius, to his own misfortune, had espoused.

SUCCESSORS OF JUSTINIAN.—Justinian’s successor was the most courtly but not the most able of his five nephews, Justinian II., the husband of Sophia, niece

of Theodora. His reign was a tissue of blunders and crimes. The new emperor, ill-advised by his wife, alienated his generals, particularly Narses, exasperated the Avari, wantonly displeased the mighty Khosroes, and drew upon himself such woes as deprived him of reason. Nevertheless, the Empress Sophia laudably counselled him to entrust the command to the excellent general Tiberius Constantine, who humbled Khosroes and his son Hormisdas, but was unable to effect anything against the Lombards. Maurice, the son-in-law and successor of Tiberius II., gloriously concluded the war against the Persians. Khosroes II., whom he defended against an usurper, became a faithful ally. Yet his generals were unsuccessful against the Avari, owing to want of military discipline. The army at last revolted at the instigation of the centurion Phocas, whom they proclaimed emperor (602). Maurice saw five of his sons beheaded before he himself received the mortal stroke. His eldest son, Theodosius, was killed shortly after, as also the Empress Constantina and her three sons. Eight years later Heraclius retaliated upon the cruel Phocas. Thus closed the first period and the third dynasty of the Lower Empire.

#### **Sec. 4. The Lombards in Italy (568–774).**

ALBOIN.—The Lombards, established in Pannonia by Justinian, coveted the possession of Italy from the time of the expulsion of the Ostrogoths. Alboin, their king, feared Narses, however, and preferred to crush the Gepidæ in alliance with the Avari, recently come from Asia. While his allies took the territory of the vanquished, Alboin was satisfied to have the skull of his son-in-law Cunimond, king of the

Gepidæ, for a drinking-cup. The subjects of Alboin resembled him by assuming the appearance of ferocious animals thirsting for blood. They shaved the back of the head, and let their hair hang down in front in two hideous tresses that blended with the beard, from which they derived the name of Lombard (longbeard). The Lombards watched the opportunity to pounce upon Italy. The Emperor Justinian II. aided their cause by unseasonably recalling the aged Narses, whom the Empress Sophia detested. The expostulations of the general provoked only a more positive and humiliating recall. Then, consulting only his desire of revenge, Narses quitted Ravenna, withdrew to Naples, and, it is said, enticed the Lombards to invade Italy. A counter order, which his friend Pope John III. induced the dying Narses to issue, came too late; the barbarians were already on the way (568).

Alboin cleared the Julian Alps without difficulty and founded the Lombard duchy of Friuli. Arrived at Milan he had himself proclaimed by his soldiers King of Italy; then he marched upon the south, where he founded the duchies of Spoleto and Beneventum. Other duchies were founded by his victorious chiefs, while the king was besieging Pavia, which held out for three years. This city became the capital of the Lombard kingdom, which lasted two hundred years (573-774).

Rome, Ravenna, several maritime cities of the north and some provinces of the south were all that remained to the emperors of the East. The exarch of Ravenna was the representative of the emperors in Italy. Central Italy was subjected to barbarian feudalism. Alboin did not long enjoy his triumph.

During a banquet he ostentatiously drank from the skull of Cunimond. "Do you also drink from your father's cup," said the barbarian to the queen. She made no answer, but a few days after caused him to be assassinated. The Lombards, however, took summary vengeance upon her.

THE LOMBARD KINGDOM.—Cleph, who was elected to succeed Alboin, ravaged Italy, slew many Romans, and was in turn slain after a reign of two years (575). The ten following years there was an interregnum, during which the nation was ruled by thirty-six dukes. At last their dread of the Austrasian Franks, who were allies of the Emperor Maurice, impelled them to choose Cleph's son, Antharis, as king. His election, like that of his father, consisted in the presentation of a pike, a ceremony which the conferring of the famous Iron Crown afterwards superseded. Antharis defeated the Greeks, and made a sudden attack on Rhegium, opposite Messina, when he was carried off by the plague. His widow, Theodolinda, was the daughter of a Bavarian prince. In 590 she married the Duke of Turin, Agiluph, who was immediately elected king by the Lombards. At the entreaty of the queen and the solicitation of Pope St. Gregory the Great, he abjured Arianism. His action was imitated by many of his subjects, and there is no doubt that their relations with the ancient inhabitants of the country were much bettered by the change; still the character of the Lombard nation always betrayed itself in the instability of the sovereigns, the merciless rapacity of the lords, and a lasting hostility to the popes.

## CHAPTER VI.

**THE CHURCH AND THE BARBARIANS.**

The Holy Catholic Church defends revealed dogma against the sophisms of the Orientals ; she converts and civilizes the barbarians who invaded the Empire of the West.

**Sec. 1. The Church Confronted with Heresies ; Authority of the Church.**

When the barbarians, at the time indicated by Providence, spread out over the Roman provinces and shared the fragments of the imperial wreck, the Church for a moment seemed lost to sight. But soon she was beheld towering aloft unharmed, the sacred deposit of faith, enforcing the respect and commanding the obedience of the rude children of the North. It is a remarkable thing that amidst the din and confusion brought about in the West by the barbarian invaders, the independent voice of St. Peter's successor was heard warning the East, only spared from the tramp of the invader, as it seems, to become the hotbed of heresy and schism.

In the East the fourth century witnessed the rise of the dangerous heresy of Arius, a deacon of Alexandria, and this soon led to the heresy of Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople. These two errors destroy the fundamental dogma of the Trinity, and were condemned by the Ecumenical Councils of Nice and Constantinople. These heresies soon infected the barbarous nations destined to chastise the old Roman world and to be in turn chastised or wholly transformed by grace.

HERESIES OF PELAGIUS, NESTORIUS, AND EU-

TYCHES; COUNCILS OF EPHESUS AND CHALCEDON.—In the fifth century a heresy which had had its inspiration in the East spread rapidly through the West. Its author was a British monk named Pelagius. The Pelagian heresy attacked grace. Immediately exposed by holy doctors, and especially by the illustrious St. Augustine, condemned by popes and deprived of the support of princes, Pelagianism was at once stifled. Then Nestorianism and Eutychianism appeared at Constantinople itself. Although these two heresies were diametrically opposed to one another, yet both assailed the dogmas of the Incarnation and Redemption. The patriarch Nestorius taught that there are in Jesus Christ two separate persons, that of the Word the eternal Son of God, and that of Christ the mortal son of Mary, and that, consequently, the Blessed Virgin should not be called Mother of God. Led into an opposite extreme, the Abbot Eutyches confused the divine and the human natures of our Lord, which are, however, so clearly distinct. The œcuménical Council of Ephesus (431) deposed Nestorius from his see, and defined the two natures and one person in Jesus Christ, and, amidst the joyful exclamations of the people of Ephesus, declared Mary to be the Mother of God (*Θεοτόκος*). The heresy of the monk Eutyches, already condemned by the great pope St. Leo, but supported by a cabal called the Latrocinium, or council of robbers, was solemnly anathematized anew in the Council of Chalcedon, in presence of the Empress St. Pulcheria and her consort, the Emperor Marcian (451).

SCHISM OF ACACIUS.—FIFTH œCUMENICAL COUNCIL.—The East did not long remain orthodox. The ambition of the bishops of Constantinople, sup-

ported by the Greek emperors, was a torment to the Church. The Patriarch Acacius urged the Emperor Zeno, under the pretext of restoring unity, to publish an edict (*henoticon*) which favored the Eutychians. Thence resulted a schism which for thirty-five years separated Constantinople from Rome, and led to one unfortunately of much greater duration. The Emperor Anastasius went to still greater lengths than his predecessor. He tore up the original acts of the Council of Chalcedon and imprisoned or massacred the orthodox priests. The peace restored by Justin I. was again compromised by Justinian. In his imprudent and tyrannical zeal he demanded the condemnation of the *three chapters* or books whose authors had been justified by the Fathers of Chalcedon. This was calculated to weaken the authority of that great assembly, and to favor the monophysite heresy of Eutyches. It was necessary to summon a new oecumenical council (553), in which Pope Vigilius made amends for his former weakness by a display of apostolic firmness within the very walls of Constantinople, in the presence of the emperor and of the Empress Theodora, the protectress of the heresy. In the East everything, even the Creed, depended on imperial caprice. The institutions of the Cæsars were modified by the whims of princes, the fickleness of the Greek character, and the stubbornness of the Orientals. This people held fast to the heresies of the fifth century, and have been punished for their waywardness by having to bear the brutalizing yoke of Mohammed.

THE WESTERNS; THE CALL OF THE BARBARIANS.—The barbarians of the North swept down like a resistless torrent upon the West. The result of

these invasions, however, was the growth of union among the western nations and a greater loyalty to the faith of the Holy Roman Church. Popes, bishops, monks, saints, and sages were all employed in instructing these new races, and we shall see later with how much success.

**THE MONKS OF THE WEST.**—The love of solitude, with the approval of Christianity, soon peopled the deserts of the Thebaïd, of Syria and Asia Minor. The life of the hermit St. Antony, written by St. Athanasius, and the monastic rules drawn up by St. Basil the Great, as well as the apology for the monks composed by St. John Chrysostom, all served to encourage a desire for the religious life. Monasteries arose throughout the East, even in the great cities. To these asylums fled imperilled innocence and repentant crime, the fortunate and the unfortunate, the lowly and the great. In the West the monastic system had been at an early date introduced by SS. Eusebius, Hilarion, Ambrose, and Jerome. St. Martin had fitted himself for the apostolate in the solitude of Ligugi, near Poitiers. On his elevation to the episcopate he founded the celebrated abbey of Marmoutiers, near Tours. In Ireland, St. Patrick had marked his every step with a monastery. St. Augustine had converted his episcopal household into a regular community, which served as a model for many others. St. Benedict (480–543), however, is the true patriarch of the monks of the West. The grotto of Subiaco, near Rome, and the monastery of Monte Cassino, in the vicinity of Naples, were two hives whence issued swarms of monks. The monasteries established by them sanctified labor, taught prayer and virtue, harbored letters, and civilized the barba-

rians. The rule of St. Benedict became the universal monastic code in the West, as was the rule of St. Basil in the East. As the sons of St. Benedict excelled their predecessors in activity and enterprise, so have they exceeded them in their influence upon the world. Mingling more freely with men, they taught, preached, advised, sometimes as simple monks or missionaries, sometimes in the episcopal character, or even as the representatives of the Sovereign Pontiff. The Benedictines have given to the Church about 6,000 bishops, 200 cardinals, and 35 popes.

**SAINTS AND BISHOPS.**—During the first two centuries of the mediæval age the East was edified by the virtues of SS. Cyril of Alexandria, Flavian of Constantinople, John Climacus, and the Empress St. Pulcheria. At the same time flourished in the West SS. Genevieve, Severinus, Giles, and many holy monks and nuns who trod the lowly walks of life. On the thrones of the barbarians sat SS. Clotilda and Radegonda, SS. Sigismund and Hermenegild, SS. Cloud, Gontran, and Ethelbert. In the episcopate, not to mention the incomparable doctor, St. Augustine, St. Epiphanius, in Italy; St. Fulgentius, in Africa; St. Leander, in Spain; St. Austin of Canterbury, in England; St. Patrick, in Ireland; and in France, St. Avitus of Vienne, St. Sidonius of Clermont, St. Remi of Rheims, St. Gregory of Tours, the first historian of the Franks, and many others.

**LETTERS AND ARTS.**—The East, more tranquil during this period, incontestably retained its supremacy in history, poetry, and the arts. In the West the barbarians did not, of course, favor literary or artistic productions, with the sole exception of Theodoric, whose name recalls Boëthius, the philosopher

and poet; Cassiodorus, the learned writer; Ennodius, the orator and historian. In this reign, too, were built the palaces of Ravenna, Verona, and Pavia. But, even beyond the limits of Italy, we may name as orators, historians, and even as poets, the greater number of the holy bishops just mentioned, as SS. Avitus and Sidonius; and to these should be added Venantius Fortunatus. The abbeys, too, were beginning to be centres of learning wherein were taught not only the transcribing of ancient books, but also sacred eloquence, history, the arts and sciences, as well as the composition of hymns and the sacred poetry of the Church.

**THE POPES.**—Twenty-five pontiffs succeeded to the chair of St. Peter from the death of St. Siricius, in 398, to the election of St. Gregory the Great, in 590. All of them, frequently at the peril of their lives, displayed ardent zeal in defending the faith in the East and in propagating it in the West. Most of them are venerated as saints. Conspicuous amongst them are the two illustrious doctors of the Church, SS. Leo and Gregory.

## **Sec. 2. Conversion of the Barbarians.**

**THE ARIAN BARBARIANS.**—In permitting invasion to be directed against the West, Providence doubtless designed to bring the invaders within hearing of the voice of the Roman Pontiffs. Nearly all the barbarians who came in collision with the empire were infected with Arianism, which consisted in denying the divinity of that Jesus Christ in whose name they had been baptized. Many never renounced their errors, and all of these soon totally disappeared. The Alans and the Heruli—half Arians,

half pagans—vanished before the sixth century ; the Vandals lasted but a century ; the Ostrogoths, whose outset was so brilliant, ended their career in sixty years ; finally the Gepidæ were crushed on the very threshold of the empire.

The other Arian barbarians, though slow to abandon their errors, underwent a thorough transformation. More than a century had elapsed since the settlement of the Burgundians in Gaul before they abjured Arianism under their king, St. Sigismund (517). Several years later their kingdom became subject to the Franks, though it still retained its name. The Suevi cantoned in Galicia were not converted till 562, after a century and a half of independence ; they soon after blended with the Visigoths. These latter renounced their heresy in 587, after the death of the cruel Leovigild, who had immolated his eldest son, Hermenegild. Recared, the martyr's brother, also a Catholic, had the happiness of reconciling all his subjects to holy mother Church. Thus united in the faith, Spain was prepared to undergo the most terrible ordeals without losing her faith, courage, or nationality. The Lombards, through the influence of the pious Theodolinda, were converted in the reign of Agiluph, during the pontificate of St. Gregory.

**THE PAGAN BARBARIANS.**—Two tribes had penetrated the Roman territories having no knowledge of Christianity—the Franks and Anglo-Saxons, who were idolaters and votaries of Odin.

**MISSION OF THE FRANKS AND ANGLO-SAXONS.**—The miracle of Tolbiac, followed up by the instructions of SS. Waast and Remi, by the solemnity of Rheims on Christmas night, 496, when baptism was

conferred on the Frankish warriors and their king, caused joy throughout the Catholic world. The Franks were the first converts among the barbarians, and came at once to the true faith, so that they were truly the eldest sons of the Church. Not a prince of that time except the king of the Franks was Catholic. Well did St. Avitus, a Burgundian, exclaim on addressing Clovis : “ Oh ! how full of consolation this sacred night has been to the Holy Church. Your good fortune has won many victories, but your piety shall win still more. We are of a different nation, but we share in your glory, and your victory is ours.” Pope Anastasius wrote : “ Glorious and illustrious son, be the consolation of your mother, the Holy Church ; be an unshaken column for her support. We give thanks to the Lord that he has brought you out of the power of darkness to bestow on his Church so great a prince, a champion for her defence against all enemies.”

We have related how the monk Austin landed on the Isle of Thanet, his coming to Canterbury, and the docility of King Ethelbert. From the kingdom of Kent Christianity spread, though not without hindrance, into the neighboring kingdoms from south to north, from Saxons to Angles ; bishoprics were erected, monasteries founded, and Catholic England could furnish missionaries to convert other northern tribes, and at the same time cultivate letters and sacred sciences under the patronage of the Roman Pontiffs. That was her mission, and well might she glory in it ; nor should Catholics, especially those of Germany, ever forget it.

TRIUMPH OF THE CHURCH ; ST. GREGORY THE GREAT (SEPTEMBER 3, 590–MARCH 12, 604).—The

barbarians overrunning the Roman provinces in search of plunder, thirsting for blood and vengeance, and looking for fertile lands to occupy, would, in the natural order of things, have trampled down civilization and overthrown the Church. But two centuries passed away, a century less than was needed to convert the Roman world, and the invading barbarians were either annihilated or, having become Catholics, were helping to organize a new civilization.

In A.D. 600, the great Pope St. Gregory I., triumphant at last over the most terrible assaults, saw with thanksgiving that the reign of Jesus Christ was spreading out even beyond the ancient limits of the empire. In the East his will, if not punctually obeyed, was respected by the Emperor Maurice and the usurper Phocas; Armenia, Persia, Arabia, Ethiopia, even China, numbered many Christians. In the West the Lombards alone, though converted to the faith, caused apprehension by their rapacity, though from time to time they yielded to the moral influence of the Papacy. The Visigoth kings of Spain and the Merovingians of France afforded consolation, and the kings of the Anglo-Saxon heptarchy gave the fairest hopes. The schools of Ireland were thronged by students from all parts of Europe. The Roman pontiff could give his undivided attention to works of inexhaustible charity, to the administration of the important temporalities of his see, the reorganization of the episcopacy in the provinces, and the splendor of divine worship. This he did by learned treatises, by memorable liturgical compositions, and by the ecclesiastical chant which bears his name. The nations were evangelized, Christ reigned, the Church was triumphant.

## SECOND EPOCH (604-814),

*FROM THE DEATH OF ST. GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE—210 YEARS.*

During this epoch, characterized by the *formation of Christian Europe*, we behold the Carlovingian and the Arabian rising side by side with the Western Empire. The Carlovingians, with the concurrence of the Church, obtain the preponderance and organize the states arising from the blending of the barbarians with the populations of the Roman Empire.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### PREPONDERANCE OF THE CARLOVINGIANS.

The Carlovingians having become the depositaries of power among the Franks, drive the Mohammedans beyond the Pyrenees, check the invasion of the German barbarians by civilizing them, confirm the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See, destroy the kingdom of the Lombards, and re-establish under a new form the ancient Empire of the West.

#### Sec. 1. The “Sluggard” Kings and the Mayors of the Palace (638-752); *Pepin of Heristal and Charles Martel.*

THE SONS AND GRANDSONS OF DAGOBERT; THE FIRST CARLOVINGIANS.—On the death of Dagobert I. (638) his states were divided between his two sons, Sigebert II., who obtained Austrasia, and Clovis II., to whom were given Neustria and Burgundy. With these two princes, who were still minors, begins the dynasty of the Merovingian kings, surnamed the “Sluggards,” because they did nothing worthy of their birth and rank. It is but just to remark that the greater number died young, and

that nearly all were reared under the direction of a “mayor of the palace,” who profited by their weakness to augment his own power. The mayor of the palace was originally but the first officer and steward of the palace (*major domus*), whom the king appointed or discharged at will. At the death of Sigebert I. (575) the grandees of Austrasia claimed the right of choosing a mayor for his son, then a child, and this dangerous assumption continued despite the opposition of Brunehaut. Though the mayorship was elective and revocable, on the demand of the Austrasian lords, who were influenced by Pepin the Elder of Landen, it became an office for life (613).

Thus Pepin prepared the greatness of his family, called the *Carlovingian*, from Charlemagne, its most illustrious representative. From the opening of the seventh century this family exerted a decisive influence in the affairs of Austrasia. It possessed immense riches and numerous clients or warriors devoted to its service. Its domains have been estimated at as many as one hundred and twenty-three; among them Landen and Heristal on the banks of the Meuse. The zeal of this family for religion is above suspicion, as it furnished admirable examples of virtue and sanctity. Pepin himself, in his functions of mayor of the palace, lived the life of a saint. “In all his judgments,” says his biographer, “he studied to conform his decisions to the rules of divine justice; he was directed in all his plans and affairs by the Blessed Arnulf, Bishop of Metz, whom he knew to be eminent in the fear and love of God. Abhorring all evil, he acted justly and honorably, and was firm in the exercise of good works.” Grimoald, son of Pepin, succeeded him as mayor of the palace and inherited

his talents, but not his moderation and fidelity. At the death of Sigebert II. (656) he undertook to place on the throne his own son instead of the royal heir, whom he secretly sent to Ireland, under the pretence of being educated there, but really to keep him out of the way. This usurpation cost him his life.

The Merovingians would never have had reason to fear for the crown if all who ruled in their name had had the virtues of St. Bathilda. This pious queen, the widow of Clovis II., was regent during the minority of her eldest son, Clotaire III. Her tender charity for the unfortunate and her efforts to abolish slavery in the kingdom of the Franks had conciliated the affection of the people, when she was dethroned by an ambitious upstart. Ebroin, having by intrigues obtained the office of mayor of the palace, employed the most violent means to subvert every measure that was calculated to lessen his authority. Trampling under foot the laws of the kingdom and selling justice, he lavished his favors on adventurers, while the lords were either despoiled of their possessions and dignities or exiled and put to death; even the Bishop of Paris fell by the dagger of an assassin. After the death of Clotaire the arrogant minister thought he could dispose of the crown; but he was foiled, and owed his life to the intervention of St. Leger, Bishop of Autun, whom he regarded with implacable hatred. After a banishment of several months, spent in the monastery of Luxeuil, he recovered his titles and his power. The holy Bishop of Autun was the first victim of his vengeance. Having surrendered himself, in order to save his people, his eyes were put out and he was then put to death like a malefactor.

Ebroin, undisputed master of Neustria and Burgundy, was planning to bring Austrasia under his tyrannical yoke when he in turn fell by the dagger of an assassin (681). The Austrasians, weary of his rule, had already chosen as their duke (679) the head of the Carlovingian family, Pepin of Heristal, grandson of Pepin the Elder and of St. Arnulf. An astute politician and indefatigable warrior, Pepin of Heristal profited by the state of affairs ; he refused to deliver up a great number of Neustrian and Burgundian lords who had sought shelter in Austrasia. Bertaire, successor of Ebroin in the mayorship of the palace, appealed to arms, but lost the battle and his life (687). Thus Pepin of Heristal secured the triumph of Austrasia over Neustria. Ruling thenceforth, in the name of King Thierry III., over all the empire of the Franks, he restored order and enforced his authority. He carried his victorious arms into Germany, and again subdued the Germans, Bavarians, Frisians, and Saxons ; but, to subdue these races who were still pagan, he relied less on the power of his arms than on the zeal of the missionaries. He gave a good part of the twenty-seven years of his government (687-714) to the spread of the Gospel, and he had the glory of contributing to the success of St. Willibrod, apostle of the Frisians.

**CHARLES MARTEL (714-741); BATTLE OF TOURS (732); END OF THE MEROVINGIANS (752).**—Pepin of Heristal had confided to his wife, Gertrude, the guardianship of his grandson, but five years old, already named mayor of the palace. A woman and a child could not control so many warlike races. The Austrasians, attacked in their own country, put at their head a son of Pepin, who inherited all his

ability, known later as Charles Martel, because like a hammer he crushed his enemies. By his first success he delivered Austrasia; he then advanced to the walls of Soissons, and in one day upset the projects of the Neustrians, then leagued with Eudes, Duke of Aquitaine (719). Soon afterwards the tributaries of Germany were compelled to return to their allegiance.

Charles, now sole master, was called upon to resist the Mussulmans, who, after ravaging a great part of Asia and Africa, had just appeared in Spain, where they destroyed the monarchy of the Visigoths. The design of Abd-er-Rahman, their general, was to exterminate or to enslave all the inhabitants of France and establish Mohammedanism on the ruins of Christianity. The frightened people fled in all directions. The Duke of Aquitaine had been defeated near Bordeaux, and the infidels had almost reached Tours, when Charles came up to encounter them. He vigorously attacked the infidels, captured their camp, hewed them to pieces, and drove the flying remnants into the fastnesses of the Pyrenees. By this glorious victory Charles Martel saved not only France but all Christendom, and on its account was surnamed "the hammerer." The duke of the Franks, faithfully imitating his father, assisted the progress of the true faith in Germany. He sent many missionaries amongst the idolaters. The most zealous of these was St. Boniface, the apostle of Germany. So many services to Church and state rendered Charles the arbiter of the West. His authority among the Franks was such that for three years he left the throne without its "sluggard" king. On his death he divided his inheritance between his two sons, Carloman and Pepin. The two brothers had just subdued Hunald,

son of Eudes, Duke of Aquitaine, when the elder, desiring to secure his salvation, retired to the monastery of Monte Cassino in Italy (747). Pepin, sole ruler of the empire, was feared by his neighbors, respected by the great, esteemed by bishops, and cherished by the people. He thought the time opportune to take the final steps to the throne and wear the crown, a symbol of the power that he alone exercised. The assembly of bishops and lords, by the advice of Pope Zachary, proclaimed Pepin and deposed Childeric III., who was shut up in a monastery. Thus ended the Merovingian dynasty, after reigning two hundred and sixty-nine years.

**Sec. 2. Pepin the Short (752-768) and Charlemagne (768-814); Foundation of the Temporal Power of the Popes (755); Restoration of the Western Empire (800).**

PEPIN FOUNDS THE TEMPORAL SOVEREIGNTY OF THE HOLY SEE (755).—Pepin, consecrated first by St. Boniface, was again consecrated by Pope Stephen II., who had come in person to ask aid for the Holy See. Astulph, the king of the Lombards, having wrested the exarchate of Ravenna from the Greeks, was eager to subdue Rome, which had withdrawn from the Eastern Empire. He paid no attention to Pepin's warning to abandon his projects. But he was defeated by the Franks and compelled to sign a treaty by which he agreed to evacuate the exarchate of Ravenna and renounce his claim to the capital of the Christian world. Scarcely was the danger averted than he violated his promises and renewed the siege of Rome. Pepin again crossed the Alps and threatened

to deprive the perjured prince of all his states unless he agreed to fulfil the first treaty and pay tribute to the Holy See. The keys of all the places donated to the Roman Church were laid on the tomb of St. Peter, in homage to his sovereignty in the person of his successors.

Such was the definitive establishment of the temporal power which the popes had wielded for several years in Rome and the surrounding cities. As long as the Roman Empire covered the known world, the sovereign pontiffs shared with the faithful the persecutions and triumphs of religion ; sometimes protected by a Constantine and a Theodosius, at others oppressed by a Constans and a Julian. But after the Roman power had given place to so many others, differing in aims and in interests, it seemed to please Providence to render the popes independent, and to invest them with such power as, without rendering them formidable, should yet enable them to exercise their spiritual authority freely, and untrammelled by the secular powers of the Christian world.

**CONQUEST OF SEPTIMANCA (759), AQUITANIA (768), AND NORTHERN ITALY (774).**—Pepin the Short, more fortunate than his father in his expeditions into Septimanca (Valladolid), succeeded in driving the infidels from that fair province. An obstinate struggle against Waïfre, son and successor of the Duke Hunald, won for him the honor of being the first French king whose dominion took in all ancient Gaul (768).

Brilliant as was the career of Pepin the Short, he had a son who was to surpass him and to acquire the surname of Great. Charlemagne (*Carolus Magnus*) had just received the inheritance of his brother Car-

loman (771), and driven from Aquitaine the old Duke Hunald, when he was obliged to turn his arms against the Lombards. King Didier, successor to Astulph, surrounded Rome. At the head of a powerful army Charles opened a passage through the Alps, and in one campaign subdued all Northern Italy. Didier, besieged in Pavia, was compelled to abdicate the title of king of the Lombards in favor of the victor (774). Thus was annihilated a power so long dangerous to the Holy See at Rome. Charlemagne renewed the alliance of France with the successor of St. Peter.

WARS WITH THE SAXONS (772-804), THE SARACENS (778), THE BAVARIANS (788), THE SLAVS, AND THE AVARI (796).—Charlemagne, endowed with prodigious activity, undertook fifty-three expeditions. The first after that of Aquitaine was provoked by a revolt of the Saxons. That barbarous people, who had settled on both banks of the Weser, detested the Franks, because they had adopted the Roman faith and manners. To avenge the massacre of missionaries and the pillage of churches, Charlemagne entered the country of the Saxons and repeatedly obliged them to sue for peace. Finding them always rebellious or perjured, he thought to intimidate them by a terrible chastisement. In a single day 4,500 of the most guilty were beheaded on the banks of the Aller (782). This was the signal for a desperate war which lasted till Witikind, the Saxon chief, consented to receive baptism (785). The partial revolts that still occurred were at last suppressed by the banishment of several thousand of the inhabitants, and by the foundation of monasteries and bishoprics destined to throw the light of the Gospel upon the country.

In the interval of his wars against the Saxons

Charlemagne bore his victorious arms throughout all his other frontiers. An expedition against the Saracens of Spain gave him all the territory as far as the Ebro, but, suddenly attacked on his return by the Gascons while marching through the defile of Roncevalles, he lost a great number of warriors, among whom was the famous Roland, so renowned in story for his bravery and wonderful adventures.

Charlemagne had defeated the terrible Witikind, when he was informed of a great conspiracy which Tassillon, Duke of Bavaria, had formed against him, in concert with the Greeks, the Slavs, and the Avari (788). His measures were so well taken that all his enemies were successively overthrown. Tassillon, abandoned by his own subjects, lost his duchy. The Greeks were defeated in Italy, and the Lombard duchy of Beneventum was compelled to pay tribute. After an expedition along the right bank of the Elbe the Slavs were forced to swear fealty. The Avari also, on the Theiss, sustained so many reverses that they were almost annihilated, and lost (796) a vast entrenched camp where for several centuries they had accumulated the spoils taken from all the surrounding nations.

**CHARLEMAGNE EMPEROR (800); HIS POWER.—** Charlemagne, having united under his sway all the countries that had formed the Empire of the West, was honored at Rome with the title of emperor. This was a suitable reward for his military exploits, his lofty wisdom, his zeal for the conversion of idolaters, and the constant protection which he afforded the Holy See. He had just delivered Pope Leo III. from a cruel persecution. On Christmas Day, 800, while assisting at the divine office in the basilica

of St. Peter, Leo III., robed in his pontifical vestments and followed by his clergy, approached the pious monarch and placed the imperial crown upon his head. At the same moment the church resounded with prolonged acclamations: "Long live Charles Augustus, crowned by God's own hand! Long life and victory to the great and pacific Emperor of the Romans!" Thus did the Western Empire receive a new birth in the person of Charlemagne, 324 years after the deposition of Romulus Augustulus.

Charlemagne, then in his fifty-eighth year, extended his dominion from the Ebro to the Oder and from Brittany to Southern Italy. He completely subdued the Slavs and the Danes, and closed Germany against them by securing to that country the double benefit of civilization and Christianity. He assembled a fleet of ships on the Neustrian coast to keep off the Norman pirates, who were already becoming troublesome. He drove out the Saracens from Sardinia, Corsica, and the Balearic Isles, and pursued them beyond the Ebro. This potent monarch, who was the first to organize all the western races into a vast Christian society, was also the first to oppose a barrier to the invasion of pagan barbarism from the North and Mussulman fanaticism from the South.

The fame of the mighty emperor of the West had crossed the seas and penetrated to the Orient. Caliph Harun-al-Rashid, then master of Jerusalem, conceived such respect and admiration for him that he sent him ambassadors laden with magnificent presents. The emperors of Constantinople sought his alliance; and it was even hoped at one time that

he would reunite the East and West by espousing the Empress Irene. The king of the Asturias placed himself and all the Christians of Spain under his protection, and the kings of England attended his court less to admire him in the splendor of his power than to learn the art of governing their subjects.

GOVERNMENT OF CHARLEMAGNE.—Charlemagne had taken up his residence at Aix-la-Chapelle, in the centre of his vast empire, so that he might the more easily maintain order and peace. Enjoying absolute authority, he decided all important affairs. He had, however, several ministers to assist him with their counsels : a grand almoner, for ecclesiastical affairs ; a count palatine, for civil affairs ; a chancellor, a seneschal, a grand marshal of the palace, and a number of other officers, who composed the most brilliant and well-ordered court seen since the fall of the Roman Empire. In every country were dukes, counts, centurions, and tithing-men charged with the administration. These rendered an account to two imperial commissioners, ordinarily a bishop and a lay lord, who made a visitation of the country four times a year, to hear complaints and reform abuses. Their rule of conduct was drawn up by the emperor himself. Nothing relating to the interests of his subjects was indifferent to him ; and though his solicitude was given to the government of states so vast, he found time to observe, at stated hours, whether any disorder crept into his own household.

CAPITULARS.—The laws of Charlemagne, and of the other Carlovingian princes, are known by the name of capitulars, because the various regulations that compose them are divided into short chapters (*capitulum*). The capitulars were promulgated in

the general assemblies which Charlemagne convoked twice a year, in spring and autumn ; the first being by far the more important. These assemblies were composed of bishops and lords, and deliberated on all affairs of church and state, under the direction of the emperor, who adopted the best counsels ; so that these assemblies, so dangerous under the “sluggard” kings, exercised a most beneficial influence on the country. There are extant sixty-five of Charlemagne’s capitulars, which enter into the minutest details of the administration—as, how many domestic fowls are to be raised, trees planted, etc. Nothing is more instructive than to see this mighty legislator adapting and improving the peculiar laws of each nation, when he could so easily have set them entirely aside.

He depended upon the efficacious influence of religion to change the manners of the people. For this reason the greater part of his capitulars are ecclesiastical laws, which prescribe obedience to bishops, payment of tithes to the clergy, and command a faithful observance of all the precepts of the Church.

**CHARLEMAGNE A PATRON OF LETTERS.**—Charlemagne did not confine himself to military and civil science ; he also caused literature to be held in honor among his subjects. Assisted by the grammarian, Peter of Pisa, and the Anglo-Saxon monk, Alcuin, he conferred new splendor on the palace school, which he converted into a sort of academy under the direction of Alcuin. The emperor was a member of this academy under the name of “David” ; others were called “Pindar,” “Homer,” “Augustine,” etc. The imperial family and all the court were present at the lessons of the erudite Alcuin. From the court the love

of learning spread rapidly throughout the empire. Among the useful establishments due to the genius of Charlemagne were the numerous schools confided to bishops and abbots, under the superintendence of the palatine school director. In the *minor* schools, which were public, were taught grammar, arithmetic, psalmody, and all the elements of Christian doctrine. In the *major* schools the object of the teaching was sacred and profane science; the first comprised theology, Holy Scripture, canon law, and the holy Fathers; the second embraced what were known in mediæval times as the seven liberal arts—viz., grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. Charlemagne himself stimulated the ardor of the students and was fully competent to judge of their progress. He spoke Latin as fluently as his mother tongue, and thoroughly understood Greek. The seven liberal arts had no mysteries that he had not fathomed. Naturally eloquent, he expressed himself extemporaneously on all subjects with grace and ease. In a word, honoring the learned, he was himself one of the most learned men of his age.

DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE (814).—Charlemagne closed his glorious career, by a holy death at Aix-la-Chapelle, in the seventy-second year of his age. In a rich basilica, raised by his zeal, he was entombed, seated on a golden throne, having at his side a golden sword, in his hands and on his knees the Gospel, of the same metal, arrayed in his imperial robes and wearing the hairecloth which he was accustomed to have on his person. “No one can express,” says a contemporary, “what tears and lamentations his death called forth throughout the earth; even the pagans bewailed him as the father of the world.” As

remarkable for his virtues as his genius, his burning zeal for the faith and for the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline, his profound recollection during the holy mysteries, his singular veneration for the Holy Scriptures, his rigorous fasts and other austerities, his strict justice, his paternal care of the poor, of widows, and orphans, finally, his good works of all kinds have merited for him in several churches the title of Saint, as his exploits have won for him everywhere the surname of Great.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### MOHAMMEDANISM—EMPIRE OF THE ARABS.

Mohammed, pretending to found a new religion, inspires the Arabs with a spirit of proselytism and conquest. In their first attempt, under the elective caliphate, the Arabs wrest several provinces from the Eastern Empire and destroy the Persian dominion ; in a second, under the Ommiades, they penetrate to the interior of Asia, take all northern Africa, and advance through Spain to the south of Gaul. But the sword of the Franks checks their conquests, and the rivalry of their leaders effects the division of their empire into two caliphates, which are soon dismembered into many independent dynasties.

#### Sec. 1. Mohammed (570–632) and the Koran ; *Mohammed at Mecca (570–622) ; His pretended Mission.*

In the mountainous country known as Hedjaz lies the city of Hedjaz (Mecca), which, even in the sixth century, was the most important town of Arabia. Favorably situated for commerce between Syria and Yemen (Arabia Felix), it, moreover, boasted the possession of the temple of Kaaba, which was famous

and venerated among the natives. According to the Arabs, this temple was a gift from God himself to their forefathers, and had been the oratory of Abraham and Ismael. In one of its corners was the *black stone* which was believed to have been the nucleus of the earth, and which, having been blackened by sin, would in the end recover its former dazzling whiteness. Round about were ranged three hundred and sixty idols belonging to the different tribes of Arabia, so that the Kaaba was a sort of national pantheon. Every year numerous caravans of pilgrims visited Mecca to kiss the black stone seven times, and to run as many times around the sacred fane.

The guardianship of the Kaaba belonged to the family of Hashem, the most illustrious of the tribe of the Koreishites, who claimed to be the descendants of Ismael. Of this family was born Mohammed in 570. Orphaned at six years, with no other inheritance than an old female slave, several sheep, and five camels, he was obliged to spend his youth in keeping flocks and in carrying on business for the rich widow of a kinsman, called Khadijah. He found means to marry Khadijah, and so obtain rank among the richest and most influential citizens of Mecca. This did not satisfy his ambition; he aspired to become a prophet and the founder of a new religion. Having no proofs in favor of his pretended mission, he worked upon the imagination of his countrymen by mysterious and prolonged retreats in a cave near Mecca. One night, it was said, while he was absorbed in profound reflection, the archangel Gabriel appeared to him and presented a book, saying, "Take and read." "I cannot read," answers Mohammed. Thrice the same command elicits the same reply, and thrice the arch-

angel, seizing Mohammed by the hair, throws him to the earth. The third time Mohammed rises, and, to end the painful lesson, declares that he can read as well as the archangel himself.

The new religion thus revealed was that of Islam, which imposed on its follower, or Mussulman, the blindest submission to the commands of God speaking by his prophet's mouth. To gain this ascendancy Mohammed relied on the ardent and enthusiastic character of the Arabians, their daring and warlike disposition. His first proselytes were his wife, his cousin Ali, his father-in-law, Abu-Bekir, Othman, Omar, and others. At the end of three years (614) he assembled at a great banquet all the members of his family, and announced to them the extraordinary mission which he had received from the archangel Gabriel. "Which of you," said he, "will be my vizier [lieutenant]?" "I," replied Ali, then about fourteen years old. "Apostle of God, I will help thee; if any one resist thee I will shatter his teeth, pluck out his eyes, cleave his body, and break his limbs." At these words Mohammed, transported with joy, named the young Ali his lieutenant. Several of the guests acknowledged Mohammed as the vicegerent of God, but the greater number turned him into ridicule and treated him as a madman. For eight years his enemies carried on a bitter war against him. The Koreishites were especially vindictive, as their interests were involved in the preservation of idolatry. They deprived the family of Hashem of the guardianship of the Kaaba, and confided it to the Ommiades, a rival family. Mohammed, daily exposed to injuries, and often threatened with death, at last fled from Mecca during the night. Ali assisted in the escape

by wearing the prophet's green robe, and thus received the blow aimed by the adversaries of Islam. The prophet fled to the city of Yatreb, since called Medina-al-nabi (city of the prophet), or simply Medina (*the city*). With this flight (*hidjira*) begins the hegira or era of the Mussulmans (622).

MOHAMMED AT MEDINA (622-632); SUBJECTION OF ARABIA AND BEGINNING OF THE HOLY WAR.— Mohammed, backed by the inhabitants of Medina and the companions of his flight, did not hesitate to employ force of arms to confirm his new religion. His first exploit was a deed of vengeance and robbery perpetrated on the inhabitants of Mecca. Having learned that a rich caravan, escorted by the Koreishites, was about to enter the valley of Beder, not far from Medina, he formed an ambuscade with 300 men. Falling unexpectedly upon his enemies, he killed sixty, put the others to flight, and secured considerable booty, the fifth of which he reserved to himself. Fourteen of his men fell under the blows of the Koreishites, and were honorably buried and revered as the first martyrs of Islamism.

The Koreishites, breathing vengeance, soon retaliated. Mohammed was vanquished in his turn, but rallied the courage of his partisans by alleging a revelation of the archangel Gabriel. The Jewish tribes in the vicinity, leagued with the Koreishites, besieged him in Medina. He dispersed them by exciting division among them, so that he was enabled to obtain of the Koreishites a truce of ten years. The rupture of the truce afforded him a pretext for completing his triumph; he entered Mecca at the head of 10,000 men and proceeded to the Kaaba. Striking the idols in succession with a wand, he ex-

claimed : “Truth appears ; let lying vanish.” The three hundred and sixty idols were dashed to pieces and all the citizens swore fidelity.

Mohammed had announced that he would extend his empire still further. At one time, while engaged in digging in the trench that defended Medina, he struck some sparks from a rock. “The first of these sparks,” cried he, “announces the subjection of Yemen ; the second, the conquest of Syria and the West ; the third, the conquest of the East.” Having subdued Mecca, he easily imposed Islamism on the greater part of the Arabians. Some, by an annual tribute, were allowed for a time to retain the Judaism or the corrupt Christianity to which they had been attached ; others yielded to force of arms. After Arabia, Mohammed wished to reduce the surrounding countries. Khosroes, King of Persia, was the first potentate to whom he addressed an invitation to embrace Islamism. The epistle began thus : “In the name of the bountiful and merciful God, Mohammed, the envoy of God, to Khosroes, king of Persia, salutation.” Khosroes, offended to see the name of an adventurer placed before his own, refused to read the letter and tore it in fragments. On hearing this Mohammed exclaimed : “Thus let his kingdom be rent !” Heraclius, Emperor of the East, and other princes, showed more regard for the message of the false prophet, but the Greeks of Syria massacred his envoy. He proclaimed a holy war against them, and for the first time sent forth his disciples from Arabia. It can be imagined what a hold fanaticism had on these warriors, who had been promised victory in the name of Heaven. A cousin of the prophet bore the sacred banner, and, when both his hands had been cut off,

he still raised it aloft with his mutilated arms, and received fifty-two wounds in defending it.

Mohammed, clad in his green robe, advanced at the head of 30,000 men to the frontiers of Syria. Disappointed in not meeting the enemy he prepared himself for death. Followed by 114,000 Mussulmans, he hied to Mecca to perform his farewell pilgrimage (632). Having respectfully kissed the black stone seven times, he made seven turns around the temple, three running, then four with measured pace ; this done, he immolated with his own hand sixty-three camels, equalling the years of his age. Scarcely had he returned to Medina than he was reduced to the last extremity by an incurable malady from which he had suffered during four years. A Jewish woman, burning to avenge the death of her brother, poisoned the mutton that was served up to the prophet. Mohammed detected the poison while eating. Questioning the woman, she answered : "If thou wert a prophet thou wouldest have escaped the danger ; if thou art not, the world will be rid of an impostor." The false prophet in his last days was tortured by remorse, and exposed his imposture by announcing his design of writing a new Koran. "I desire," said he, "to write a book which will lead no one into error after my death." The scandalized Mussulmans who were present protested against this, and asked in wonder if they had not already a Koran sufficient for this life and the next. They fell into warm disputes over the affair, and the tumult became so great that Mohammed bluntly dismissed them all. "It is not proper," said he, "to quarrel in the presence of the envoy of God." Thenceforth he would have no other witness of his agony than his youngest wife, Ayesha, who be-

trayed the confidence he placed in her, by revealing later the swoons and terror of the apostle of Islam when he was about to appear at the tribunal of God.

THE KORAN.—DOCTRINE OF ISLAMISM.—The Koran, or *book*, is the civil and religious code of the Mussulmans. It comprises one hundred and fourteen chapters, which are divided into verses. Mohammed composed them at different times and at long intervals, at moments when he pretended to be in direct communication with Heaven. At such times he fell to the earth in frightful convulsions, foaming and covered with sweat, as if seized with epilepsy or possessed by the devil. He gave out that these were ecstasies caused by the visits of the archangel Gabriel, who, unseen by others present, revealed the commands of God to the prophet. As Mohammed could neither read nor write, his disciples gathered the words as they fell from his mouth, and wrote them down upon parchment or upon palm leaves. Thus these verses, unconnected in meaning, were written and at first preserved between two tablets, but the first caliph afterwards had them arranged so as to make the Koran (Alcoran)—that is, *the book*. Besides its manifest incoherence, it contains numerous contradictions and scandalous passages, which the false prophet, in order to justify his own infamous conduct, affirmed were inspired by Heaven. Such was the infatuation of the Arabs that the lewdness of his manners was regarded by them as a divine privilege.

The doctrine of the Koran is but a monstrous medley of truth and error borrowed by Mohammed from the Christians, the Jews, and the traditions of his country. He proclaims the unity of God, but

denies the trinity of the divine Persons ; he acknowledges as true prophets Adam, Noe, Abraham, Moses, and our Lord Jesus Christ, but he blasphemously denies the divinity of the Saviour of men, and presumes to call himself the last and greatest of the prophets, so that his religion may be summed up in these terms : “ God is God, and Mohammed is his prophet.” The Koran admits the existence of angels, the immortality of the soul, the rewards and punishments of the future life. But God can reward or punish only such as are free to choose between good and evil ; while the Koran in several places denies the free will of man by the doctrine of predestination, which renders him a mere automaton in the hands of a tyrannical God. This evident contradiction between fatalism and free will would stagger any one but a Mussulman. Mohammed has also deserved the reproach of promising his followers a sensual paradise, where they will have rich garments, delightful gardens like those of Yemen, sumptuous banquets, and all those pleasures calculated to satisfy the cravings of the most carnal men.

PRECEPTS OF THE KORAN.—The Koran contains a great number of precepts : 1. The ablutions, which are a preparation for prayer ; if water cannot be had, which often happens in the desert, sand may be used. 2. Prayer, which every Mussulman makes five times a day with his face towards Mecca, besides public prayer, said every Friday in the mosque or temple in commemoration of the prophet’s flight. 3. The fast of Ramadan, or the ninth month, in remembrance of Mohammed’s retreat on Mt. Herat ; every day of this month from sunrise to sunset the true believers abstain from food, baths, perfumes, and all other

pleasures, but usage permits them to make up at night for the privations of the day. 4. The pilgrimage to Mecca, which every Mussulman is bound to perform at least once in his lifetime.

Mohammed also prescribes almsgiving and circumcision, which he borrowed from the Jews. He prohibits the use of fermented liquors and certain meats—as pork and hare, and animals that have been strangled. But of all his precepts, the one to which he attached most importance was the holy war against the unbelievers. His new religion, founded in falsehood, required fanatical soldiers, bearing in one hand the sword and in the other the Koran. In sending them forth to the conquest of the world the false prophet imposed upon them the necessity of conquering. “Before you,” he cried, “is paradise, behind you the flames of hell.”

## Sec. 2. The Elective Caliphate (632–661); *Conquests of the Arabs.*

THE FOUR ELECTIVE CALIPHS.—Mohammed, on his death-bed, had forgotten to appoint a successor. He had only charged his father-in-law, Abu-Bekir, to take his place in reciting the public prayers. This choice was sufficient to secure the votes in favor of Abu-Bekir (632–634), who took the unassuming title of caliph (vicar). He ruled during two years, and named as his successor the fierce Omar (634–644), who added to the title of caliph that of Emir-al-Mumenin (commander of the faithful). Such was his fanaticism that, after seeing with his own eyes the corpse of Mohammed, he threatened to strike off the head of any one who would dare to say that the prophet was mortal. He signalized himself by the vigor of

his administration and the number of his conquests. "He took from the unbelievers," says an historian, "36,000 cities or castles, destroyed 4,000 churches, and founded or enlarged 1,400 mosques." This formidable caliph, who may be considered joint founder of Islamism with Mohammed, was assassinated by a slave. Six of his friends, whom he had designated to choose his successor, elected Othman (644-655), the former secretary of Mohammed. He was an old man of seventy, whose hand was too unsteady to direct a conquering nation. He could neither prevent nor suppress a revolt of several influential chiefs who attacked him in Medina. To escape their thrusts he shielded his breast with the Koran; but this precaution was useless, and his death, followed by the election of Ali (655-661), became the signal for prolonged and sanguinary anarchy.

CONQUEST OF SYRIA AND THE SURROUNDING COUNTRIES (632-638).—Abu-Bekir had scarcely assumed the title of caliph than he began the conquest of Syria. The city of Bosra, which was the key of the country, was betrayed, and the Arabs advanced to Damascus. Heraclius, Emperor of the East, sent against them an army of 70,000 men; but it was destroyed, and the terrible Kaled, surnamed the Sword of God, entered Damascus. The same day Omar took possession of the caliphate and declared his intention of vigorously prosecuting the war against the Greeks and degenerate Persians. In vain did Heraclius, in order to save Syria, put sixty thousand Christian Arabs at the head of a new army, saying, "Diamond cuts diamond." Thrice the Moslems are compelled to yield ground, and thrice their armed wives in the rear drive them back to the

combat. At last victory is theirs, and they hasten to invest Jerusalem, the holiest city, in their eyes, after Medina and Mecca. The besieged, driven to extremity after a four months' defence, promised to deliver up the city to the caliph. Omar arrived from Medina mounted on a camel, affecting rustic simplicity. He was, however, not the less inexorable to the Christians, whom he condemned to pay annual tribute and compelled to submit to humiliating conditions in the exercise of their religion (638). He ordered a mosque to be built on the site of Solomon's Temple, and, going to the Church of the Resurrection, sat down in the sanctuary. At this spectacle St. Sophronius, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, burst into tears, and, turning to the Greeks, exclaimed : "Behold, indeed, the abomination of desolation in the holy place!"

The Emperor Heraclius had been so fortunate as to rescue the true cross from the sacrilegious fury of the infidels, but he soon learned that Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia had fallen into their power.

CONQUEST OF EGYPT (639-640) AND PERSIA (632-642).—Amru, charged to watch the frontiers of Egypt, eagerly desired to invade that country. On his asking leave to advance, the caliph replied : "If thou art yet in Syria, retrace thy steps ; if thou hast crossed the boundary, advance and trust in God and thy brethren." Amru, fearing a refusal, did not open the letter till he was in Egypt. The natives, known as Copts, had embraced the Eutychian heresy and detested the orthodox rule. With their aid the Arabs effected an easy conquest, their first obstacle being Alexandria, which held out for four months. It is related that Omar, on being consulted by Amru about

the great library at Alexandria, replied : “If the books agree with the Koran they are useless ; if they differ from it they are dangerous. Let them be burned.” This order was so well obeyed that the precious manuscripts served, it is said, to warm the public baths for six months.

The empire of the Persians, rent by civil war, opposed but feeble resistance to Mussulman fanaticism. The victory of Kadesiah (636) opened to the invaders the navigation of the Euphrates ; that of Nehavend, called the “victory of victories,” secured them the rest of the country. To establish their sway they founded the city of Kufa, near the Euphrates. The young king, Jezdegerd, obliged to ask aid of the Chinese emperor, was slain on the banks of the Oxus (652) ; and in his person ceased the famous dynasty of the Sassanides, which had reigned over Persia four hundred and twenty-six years.

**END OF THE ELECTIVE CALIPHATE (661).**—The fourth caliph, Ali, was cousin and son-in-law to Mohammed, who had given him in marriage his favorite daughter, Fatima. As he joined to this advantage tried valor and devotion, he had many partisans, who had already proposed (632) to choose him as the successor of the prophet. Their triumph would have been secured by his election had it not been for the implacable hatred of Ayesha, Mohammed’s widow. This artful woman easily gained over Amru, who had lost the government of Egypt, and Moaviah, who still held Syria. Moaviah, head of the powerful family of the Ommiades, distinguished himself by the conquest of Rhodes, Cyprus, the Cyclades, and the coast as far as Cilicia. He gave the signal for civil war by taking the title of Commander of the Faithful. He

marched against Ali, and fought ninety battles with him in one hundred days. On the *Camel's Day* Ayesha herself fought in person, mounted on a camel, and surrounded by seventy of the bravest warriors ; the latter all perished, and the imprudent Ayesha, having fallen into the hands of her mortal enemy, was condemned to end her days in inaction near her husband's tomb. Wearied of so bloody a struggle, the two parties had met to choose umpires when three fanatical Mussulmans, arming themselves with poisoned daggers, swore to despatch the authors of the civil war. Moaviah received but a slight wound, while Amru escaped unharmed, as his secretary, who happened to sit in his place, received the deadly thrust. Ali himself fell mortally wounded (661). His partisans regard him as the sole legitimate caliph, and consider the first three caliphs as impostors ; they accept only the letter of the Koran, and are called Sheeites, or schismatics, by the orthodox. The orthodox, or Sunnites (*sunna*, tradition), maintain the legitimacy of the first three caliphs and oral tradition ; they prevail in Turkey, while the Sheeites are principally found in Persia and the other countries of Central Asia.

### Sec. 3. The Ommiades at Damascus (661-750).

**MOAVIAH ; HEREDITARY CALIPHATE.**—After the assassination of Ali and the compulsory abdication of his son, Hassan, Moaviah caused himself to be proclaimed caliph, through the agency of the capricious Ayesha and the fierce Amru. Moaviah was the son of Abu-Sofian, the persecutor of Mohammed. He supplanted the prophet's own children, and in con-

sequence excited enmities against himself, which he sought to avert by transferring the seat of the caliphate from Arabia to Syria, and by urging on the believers to new wars against the infidels. Damascus became his capital ; the Ommiades, so called from an ancestor of Moaviah, made the caliphate hereditary in their family, though not without opposition from the sons and partisans of Ali. In less than ninety years Damascus had fourteen caliphs of the Ommiades.

SUCCESES AND REVERSES.—Notwithstanding obstacles, reverses, and change of caliphs, war was prosecuted in the East and in the West. In 670 a considerable fleet under Yesid, son of Moaviah, appeared before Cyzicus, and soon afterwards before Constantinople. Cyprus, Rhodes, and several provinces of Asia Minor were easily taken. For eight consecutive years the Moslems strove to take the capital of the Cæsars. The Greek fire hurled amongst their fleets burned their ships and killed many of the crew. This Greek fire was thrown sometimes by means of long brass tubes, and sometimes in closed shells of iron or earthenware. Moaviah was obliged to sign a truce of thirty years with Constantine Pogonatus, and even pledged himself to pay annual tribute (678). The conjuncture was critical. The haughty Akba, lieutenant of the caliph, had hastened to Africa with ten thousand Arabs ; he had founded near Carthage the city of Kairwan, and had advanced as far as the Atlantic Ocean. However, the victory of Wamba, King of the Visigoths, the resistance of the Berbers, and the arrival of a Greek army obliged the adventurer to hasten back to Egypt. His successor, Zabeir, was not more fortunate. Moreover, Moaviah perceived death approaching ; he knew that the parti-

sans of Ali were active, and that his rights were questioned even by his own family.

In fact, after his death civil war put a stop to conquest for twelve years ; Persia, Egypt, and Arabia withdrew from the allegiance of the Ommiades and set up caliphs of their own. Torrents of blood had to be shed before restoring unity in the caliphate.

NEW CONQUESTS ; NORTHERN AFRICA.—The fifth Ommiade caliph, Abdul-Melek (685-705), the first Moslem prince who had coin stamped with his effigy, was finally enabled to resume the holy war. One of his lieutenants took Armenia and the regions of the Caucasus ; then, turning southward around the Caspian Sea, he darted upon the Turks and seized Samarcand, while another army penetrated as far as Hindostan.

Into Africa, where the Greeks had fortified Carthage, destroyed Kairwan, and armed the natives, the caliph sent Hassan, Governor of Egypt, at the head of forty thousand men. Kairwan was rebuilt ; Carthage, taken and retaken, was again captured, burned, and utterly destroyed. The famous city never rose again from its ruins (698). The Greeks were driven from Africa. Constantinople, then in a state of revolution, and left to the mercy of the Bulgarians, could send no aid. Hassan was, however, checked in his victorious march by the native Berbers, Numidians, and Mauritaniens, led by Queen Cahina in defence of the country. Hassan effected his retreat upon Egypt, but Musa, his successor, crushed the natives, who had just killed Cahina ; he sold 300,000 as slaves, 30,000 he incorporated with his troops, and the rest he forced to embrace Islamism or flee to the de-

sert and mountains, where their descendants are now called Tuaregs and Kabyles, and outwardly conform to Mohammedanism.

**CONQUEST OF SPAIN (711).**—In Africa the city of Ceuta, under Count Julian, still remained in the power of the Visigoths of Spain, then ruled by Vitiza. This king had done nothing to hinder Musa, the conqueror of Africa, Sardinia, and Corsica, from seizing the Balearic Isles also ; his eyes were plucked out, and he was dethroned and replaced by Roderick. The sons of the unlucky Vitiza arose against Roderick, and were assisted by their uncle, who was the archbishop of Toledo, and by Count Julian. The latter, it is said, had particular reasons for revenging himself on Roderick. Be that as it may, he offered Musa to deliver Ceuta up to him, and induced the lieutenant of the caliph to pass into Spain. Musa reconnoitred the country, hastened his preparations, received the sanction of Damascus, and embarked twenty-five thousand men under Tarik, who had just directed the reconnoitring and given his name to the rock of Gibraltar (*Gibel al Tarik*). Landing on the 28th of April near Algesiras, the invaders overthrew Count Theodemir, Governor of Andalusia, and encamped on the Guadalete, between Cadiz and Xeres. King Roderick, not expecting this invasion, hastened from Vasconia to Toledo, his capital, and called his subjects to arms. As soon as he had collected fifty thousand soldiers he marched against the enemy, whom he hoped either to exterminate or to cast into the sea.

**BATTLE OF XERES.**—It was midsummer ; the heat, too great even for the Africans, prostrated the Goths. Roderick, as a mark of confidence in the sons of Vitiza, Eba and Sisebut, gave them the command of

the flanks, while he held the centre of the army. The battle began on Monday, July 24, and raged for three days, without victory seeming to incline either way. Then Count Julian during the night went to the Christian camp, and so aroused the resentment of Eba and Sisebut that the two princes with their troops passed over to the side of the enemy. Notwithstanding this treason, Roderick still held out until Sunday, when he was slain, fighting, by Tarik himself. The fierce victor set out for Toledo to seize the royal treasury, to organize his conquest, and to rivet the fetters of a slavery that was to weigh upon Spain for eight centuries.

Count Julian, by a just retribution, was deprived of his possessions by those whom he had served and cast into a dungeon, where he ended his days. Tarik did not receive much better treatment from Musa, who was envious of his success ; he was scourged for slightly departing from orders. Musa, desiring to take part in the conquest of Spain, sent his son, Abdul-Aziz, in one direction and Tarik in another, while he himself advanced towards Narbonne. Seized, however, by order of the caliph, and brought back to Damascus, he was publicly beaten with rods, fined, and exiled. Three years later his tormentors presented him the head of his son, Abdul-Aziz, who had been massacred by his subjects in Spain, where he had ruled with clemency. The unhappy father died of a broken heart.

PELAGIUS IN THE ASTURIAS.—Following the example of Musa, the Moslem governors of Spain, to secure the possession of the peninsula, endeavored to extend their conquests beyond the Pyrenees. But if they found Eudes, Duke of Aquitaine, always dis-

posed to close the passage of the mountains against them, they were not less harassed by an enemy they had left behind them in Spain. For the Christians who had fled to the Asturias had elected for their king the intrepid Pelagius (Pelayo), and he neglected no opportunity of chastising the invaders of his country. To end this resistance, the emir Alahor despatched 180,000 Saracens to the Asturias, but by the aid of Pelagius more than 60,000 of these infidels were cast from the cliffs into the waters of the Deva, where their bones remained without burial. Pelagius was no longer uneasy ; he ruled all the northern coast ; in the interior he extended his conquests as far as Leon. His successors greatly enlarged the little kingdom of the Asturias.

**DEFEAT OF ABD-ER-RAHMAN** (Oct., 732).—Bolder than his predecessors, the emir Abd-er-Rahman began by cruelly punishing Munusa, one of his subjects, who had leagued with the Duke of Aquitaine ; then he invaded Southern Gaul with a powerful army. Eudes, who had been defeated several times, entrenched himself in the rear of the Dordogne to defend its passage till he had been apprised of the arrival of Charles Martel on the Loire ; for Eudes had finally asked the aid of the new prince of the Franks. In the meantime Abd-er-Rahman advanced, sacking cities, pillaging the rural districts, massacring the inhabitants. Arles, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Poitiers were in flames. Scarcely did the emir issue from the latter city than he perceived Charles Martel and the Frankish battalions in position on a long ridge. The conflict was terrible ; the Saracens saw their most strenuous efforts unavailing before the cool intrepidity of the northern warriors. The arri-

val of Eudes, who charged them in the rear, utterly dispirited them; thousands of corpses strewed the plain, and amongst the dead was found the body of Abd-er-Rahman. Night covered the rest, who abandoned all their riches and all their booty to the conquerors. Christendom in the West was freed for a long while from the danger of Moslem invasion.

NEW CHECK BEFORE CONSTANTINOPLE (717).—The caliph Soliman had prepared a still more terrible attack against the capital of the Cæsars. During thirteen months a considerable fleet and a powerful land army besieged the city, notwithstanding the Greek fire, the Bulgarian auxiliaries of the empire, and the rigors of winter, to which the Arabs were not accustomed. They were forced, however, to raise the siege, after losing hundreds of vessels, thousands of men, and immense supplies. Thus did Leo the Isaurian reap the fruits of the well-organized defence of his predecessor, Anastasius II. For forty years Constantinople had been the bulwark of Christianity in the East and the stumbling-block of the Ommiade caliphs. The sword of the Franks had driven them from the West. An intestine revolution was about to decimate them.

FALL OF THE OMMIADES.—The lineal descendants of Mohammed by Ali and Fatima constantly pressed their claim to the inheritance, usurped by Moaviah. Their green turbans, which distinguished them from the Ommiades, whose color was white, rendered evident their superiority in numbers. The disesteem in which they were held by all not of their party favored the claims of a third family, descended from Abbas, uncle of Mohammed. These children of Abbas, or Abbassides, had chosen black for their

turbans, their garments, and their two standards; they professed themselves the avengers of outraged rights, and took advantage of the errors, vices, and reverses of the Ommiades to win partisans for themselves. The three brothers, Ibrahim, Abul-Abbas-Abdallah, and Al-Mansur, heads of the Abbassides, soon appeared on the scene of action. Three caliphs having disappeared in one year, several provinces refused to acknowledge the fourth, Merwan II. The Abbassides fomented the revolt. Ibrahim was poisoned, but his brother, Abul-Abbas, declared himself caliph and pursued Merwan, who was slain on the banks of the Nile. He then made a frightful slaughter of the Ommiades, one of whom, Abd-er-Rahman, escaped (750).

#### **Sec. 4. The Abbassides ; Dismemberment of the Caliphate.**

THE FIRST ABBASSIDES (750-842).—The new caliph, Abul-Abbas, is best known in history by the pernicious influence he allowed the Persian soldiers to exercise, and by the massacres which have given him the surname of As-Seffah, “the Bloody.” His death was the signal for a civil war between his uncle, who wished to succeed him, and his brother, Abu-Jaafar, surnamed Al-Mansur, “the Victorious.” Abu-Jaafar was successful. Al-Mansur pacified the provinces and built Bagdad on a magnificent scale, and made it the seat of the caliphate. Harun-ar-Rashid, grandson of Al-Mansur, was famous for his love of letters, his success in arms, and his relations with Charlemagne. Nevertheless, he proved himself ungrateful and cruel by capriciously exterminating the family of the Barmecides, who had done

him great service. After Harun, his three sons, Al-Amin, Al-Mamun, and Matassem, succeeded in turn to the caliphate; the two last were admired for their munificence and feared for their energy. But with them expired the glory of the Abassides (842). The family continued to reside for four centuries at Bagdad, but only to see its richest provinces ravaged by dismemberment, and even its spiritual power and its independence compromised by revolt and usurpation.

FOUNDATION OF THE CALIPHATE OF CORDOVA (756).—The young Ommiade, Abd-er-Rahman, having escaped the sword of Abul-Abbas, was summoned to Spain by the friends of his family, who saluted him as their legitimate sovereign and aided him to repulse Yusef, lieutenant of the Abbassides. Abd-er-Rahman established a caliphate at Cordova and began a magnificent mosque; he then applied himself to render his rule amiable even to Christians, and to make Spain flourishing. He had, however, to struggle against the kings of the Asturias, and the Franks, who had seized Narbonne and all Septimanea. Hesham-Abul-Walid, his son and successor, endeavored to recapture Narbonne, but found it brilliantly defended by a son of Charlemagne, and was repulsed in spite of his prowess. The Frankish warriors even took Barcelona and all of Spain north of the Ebro. The caliphate lasted nearly three centuries, with very diverse alternations.

SUBSEQUENT DISMEMBERMENT; FATIMITES AND GAZNEVIDES.—In 787 Edris, great-grandson of Ali, fled from Arabia to Barbary, or Mauritania, which he conquered, and where the Alide dynasty ruled during two hundred years. The son of Edris built Fez,

the capital of the Edrisides. Three years after the flight of Edris a certain Ibrahim-Abu-Abdallah, son of Aglab, also came from Arabia to settle at Kairwan, whence he extended his dominion over Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli. He seized upon Sardinia, and treason put his successors in possession of Sicily. The Aglabides were dispossessed at the end of a century, not by the Abbassides, but by their more formidable rivals, the Fatimite caliphs. These latter were issue of Obeidallah, who claimed to be a descendant of Fatima, Mohammed's daughter, and openly took the title of caliph. Having subdued all Northern Africa, they took possession of Egypt and drove out all rivals. They built Cairo, which they made the centre of their caliphate, that soon embraced Arabia, Palestine, and Syria to the gates of Bagdad.

In the East, Taher, general of the great and wise caliph Al-Mamun, declared himself master of Khorassan and Turkistan (820). But his descendants were speedily superseded by the Sofarides, and these again by the Samanides; the Oriental countries were for ever lost to the Abbassides. The dynasty of the Buïdes ruled in Persia and oppressed the caliphs in Bagdad itself till the arrival of the Seljuk Turks, who treated them still worse. The Tartar sovereigns, taking the title of sultan, settled at Gazna, in the valley of the Indus, whence they subjected to their sway all the Moslems of Imaus and all the rajahs of Hindostan.

### **Sec. 5. Arabian Civilization.**

**RUDE BEGINNINGS.**—Neither Mohammed nor the first caliphs appear to have given much attention to science, literature, and the arts. Their sole desire

was to propagate the Koran, which, with its fatalism and blind faith, was most unfavorable to the free discussions of philosophy, to the stirring appeals of eloquence, to the creations of poesy, to the masterpieces of architecture, of sculpture, and of painting, even when it did not actually forbid them. Moreover, the conquerors themselves, coming from Arabia, knew no other social state than the family and the tribe ; they had no civil legislation, no commerce, no currency. For this reason these new sovereigns in the beginning left to Christians or Jews the civil, administrative, and judiciary functions, which require men of letters. They employed Greek secretaries to draw up their laws, to make known their will, and to correspond with foreign princes.

IMPROVEMENTS.—The extent of their empire brought the Mussulmans into contact with different civilized nations, and they appropriated to themselves and transmitted from one end of the empire to the other several inventions which in later times have been attributed to them. Thus, paper made of cotton comes from China, the numerals called *Arabic* from India, the costly textile fabrics either from India or Persia. The Arabs borrowed their art from Christian Greeks; their science they owed to the ancient classic authors; their scanty original productions they had in spite of Islamism rather than through its inspiration.

In order to build mosques at Medina, Jerusalem, and Damascus the caliph Yezid had recourse to Constantinople for architects, and even wrought metals. Abd-er-Rahman did the same when he wished to erect the famous mosque of Alcazar of Cordova; its columns had stood in former buildings. The Arabs

were skilful only as decorators, as their *Arabesques* testify. The Abbasside caliphs, by causing Euclid, Archimedes, Aristotle, and Galen to be translated from Greek into Arabic, furnished the means of teaching mathematics, physics, natural history, and philosophy; but these text-books, studied, explained, and commented on, never received further development, even in the twelfth century, which was the time of those wise men of Islam, Avicenna (Ibn-Sina), Abu-Hamid-Algazzali, Averroës, and Tofaïl. Mohammedanism is essentially *anti-philosophical*.

SPECIALTIES.—The two sciences of astronomy and medicine were the most in favor with the Arabs. The first was limited to the calculation of some tables, and soon degenerated into astrology; the second, not being founded on anatomy and experience, was a long while in vogue before the appearance of the famous observer Avenzoar (Ibn-Zohr). As to Arabian history, it was limited to an enumeration of facts mingled with absurd tales. Tales are a specialty of the Arabians; they have left us the *Thousand and One Nights*. Their poetry, exclusively lyric and descriptive, was of high merit before Mohammed's time; the prophet prohibited it, as also painting and sculpture. Fortunately, several caliphs refused obedience, and introduced these fine arts, if not into the mosques, at least into their palaces.

BARBARISM.—Even were the Arabs not open to the charge of having burned the Alexandrian library, still it can be affirmed that they destroyed beautiful cities, laid waste rich provinces, tyrannized over polished nations, and hindered rather than advanced civilization. Nor did they promote even the material welfare of their co-religionists; sensual enjoyments

brutalized them ; and as for woman, Islamism does not mention her.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE EASTERN EMPIRE IN THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH CENTURIES.

After continual wars in the north against the Avari or the Bulgarians, in the south against the Persians or the Arabs, the empire is reduced to two-thirds its former size. Domestic troubles caused by two new heresies also contribute to its weakness.

##### Sec. 1. The Heraclian Dynasty and Monothelism.

DISASTROUS OUTSET OF HERACLIUS (610).—Phocas, the murderer of Maurice and his family, had made himself hated for his cruelty and despised for his effeminacy. Heraclius, who was a son of the exarch of Africa, invited by the very son-in-law of Phocas, had no sooner anchored with his fleet in the Bosphorus than the tyrant was brought to him in fetters. In reply to the violent reproaches of Heraclius, Phocas only said : “Govern better.” These defiant words were a lesson to the new emperor which he should have remembered. The Avari, in conjunction with the southern Slavs under the terrible Baian, menaced the empire at the north. The king of Persia, Khosroes II., laid waste Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Asia Minor, and sacked Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, whence he bore away the true cross and thousands of captives. Constantinople was reduced to the most frightful distress. For eight years Heraclius effected nothing against these enemies ; he

even thought of moving his court to Africa, but was prevented by a popular outbreak.

PERIOD OF GLORY (620-630). — Being at last aroused from his lethargy, he permitted the Croatians, Slavonians, Servians, and other Slavs to settle in the country they still occupy. He raised a powerful army among those peoples, and carried the theatre of war into the heart of Persia. At the end of seven years of success Heraclius completely overcame the Persian armies, destroyed their sacred cities, and even reached their capital, Ctesiphon, where he learned of the flight, and soon afterwards of the violent death, of the powerful Khosroes. His reward was a glorious treaty of peace with the new king of Persia, Siroës, and the restitution of the true cross, which was borne triumphantly to Jerusalem by the emperor in person. During this distant war, Constantinople nearly fell into the hands of Baian, khan of the Avari, who had come to the aid of a Persian army; but the inhabitants defended themselves with such effect that the patrician Bonosius was able to repulse the Avari with great loss (626). On that day the Avari were deprived of their ascendancy over the Slavs, Bulgarians, and others, and were compelled to canton themselves in Pannonia, where they remained until they were exterminated by Charlemagne.

ERRORS AND MISFORTUNES OF HERACLIUS; MONOTHEISM.—Success so vigorously gained seemed to presage a courageous resistance to Mussulman invasion; but Heraclius fell back into an unaccountable torpor, and seemed at times to be wanting in courage. When Damascus had been surrendered and Jerusalem was threatened, the emperor went to bring the true

cross in person to Constantinople; but on reaching the Bosphorus he was frightened by the waves of that narrow strait. A bridge of boats, covered with earth and strewn with branches, was thrown across to induce him to pass over. The defeat of his armies, the taking of his great cities, and the loss of his Eastern provinces, now withdrawn for ever from the empire and from Christendom, could not spur him to take up arms.

Some disguised Eutychians, not wishing to renounce their errors, and not daring openly to deny the two natures in Jesus Christ our Saviour, yet ventured to deny his two wills, which was tantamount to overthrowing the dogma of the Redemption. By their intrigues they had put three of their sect into the patriarchal sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople. They even deceived Pope Honorius, whom St. Sophronius of Jerusalem, the only faithful patriarch, could not warn in time. The Emperor Heraclius fell into the snare, and published an edict favoring the heresy. This edict was the beginning of misfortune for him and his family, notwithstanding the disavowal that Pope John IV. compelled him to make.

**FAMILY OF HERACLUS.**—Heraclius died in March, 641. In the following June his tomb was profaned by his eldest son, Constantine III., who opened it in search of a golden crown, after which he suddenly died. In August Heracleonas, youngest son of Heraclius, had his nose cut off and was driven from the throne to give place to Constans II., his nephew. The latter was unable to oppose the Mussulmans, but strenuously upheld the Monothelites, and issued an absurd edict forbidding all religious discussion. He

banished Pope St. Martin I. from Rome, and murdered his own brother, and his dreams were afterwards troubled by the apparition of his victim holding out a cup and crying out: "Drink, brother, drink!" To escape remorse or the hatred of his subjects he set sail in his fleet, spat at Constantinople, it is said, and steered for Italy, under pretext of reconstructing the empire; but, having vented his fury there for seven years, he was killed while in the bath at Syracuse (668). His son, Constantine IV., surnamed Pogonatus (the Bearded), put down a usurper, suppressed a mutiny among the soldiers, and defended himself successfully for six years against the Arabs who were besieging his capital. He caused the Monothelite heresy to be condemned by the Sixth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, assembled at his request under the dome of his own palace (680). This council is called *in trullo*, from the Latin word for dome. Unfortunately, his son did not at all resemble him. Justinian II., the last of his family, was worse than his grandfather. After a reign of ten years his nose was cut off and he was banished. He returned to Constantinople through the assistance of Tarbelis, King of the Bulgarians. Justinian *Rhinotmetus* (nose-cut-off), as he was called, mutilated in turn and mercilessly slew his two competitors, and at last fell under the headsman's axe (711).

Justinian II. is responsible for the abolition of ecclesiastical celibacy in the East. A new council *in trullo*, convoked by him, besides countenancing other irregularities, relaxed the primitive discipline on this point, to the great detriment of apostolic liberty and the moral dignity of the Eastern priests.

**Sec. 2. The Iconoclastic Isaurian Emperors; Accession of Leo the Isaurian (717).**

After the execution of Justinian II. three princes rapidly succeeded to the Byzantine throne, and of them Anastasius II. deserves honorable mention on account of his zeal and orthodoxy. Formerly a mercer in Isauria, he had risen through all the military grades, and had cut his way through the Arab battalions into Constantinople, where he was proclaimed emperor, and valiantly sustained a siege of two years. His successor was Leo III., surnamed the Isaurian. During a reign of twenty-four years he caused the empire to be respected by its enemies abroad, but kindled within a conflagration that made frightful ravages.

**ICONOCLASTIC EDICT (726).**—Several patriarchs of Constantinople had become heresiarchs, and several emperors had been the promoters of heresy. But Leo the Isaurian was both. It is said that, moved by the accusations of idolatry which the Mohammedans and Jews addressed to the Christians on account of the honor rendered to the images of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, and the saints, Leo issued an edict which commanded, under heavy penalties, the removal of these images from churches and private houses ; hence the name *iconoclast* (image-breaker). Leo showed a profound ignorance of the religious sentiment ; and, worse than a Vandal, he extinguished the torch of Christian art. The patriarch of Constantinople, St. Germanus, protested against the edict ; he was forced to abdicate. Learned men, monks, and numbers of the faithful resisted ; they were maltreated, exiled, or burnt. St. John Damascen, the subject and secretary of an Ommiade caliph,

wrote an apology for the sacred images ; Leo cut off his right hand. Pope St. Gregory II. wrote a letter to the emperor as respectful in form as it was energetic and logical in substance ; the emperor stripped him of his possessions, and even wished the exarch to banish him ; but the Romans and other Italians still subjects of the empire sided with the pope, in whom thenceforth they recognized the temporal sovereignty by breaking with their despotic princes.

THE HEIRS OF THE ISAURIAN.—The worthy successor of Leo III. was his son, Constantine V., surnamed Copronymus (sullied name), in allusion to his vile tastes and to an accident which occurred at his baptism. Powerless against the Arabs, who were ravaging Asia Minor, against the Slavs invading Macedonia, against the Bulgarians, who had advanced more than once, as far as Constantinople, against the Lombards, who, under their king, Luitprand, conquered the exarchate of Ravenna, he was strong only against the sacred images, on which he continued to make war during his long reign with all the brutality of his character. In a conciliabule he caused painting to be condemned, and St. John Damascen and all the orthodox Catholics to be anathematized. He died covered with ulcers. His bones were exhumed by one of his successors and burned in the place of the public executions. Leo IV. countenanced the heresy, as his father and grandfather had done, but with less violence. Constantine VI. was but ten years old. His mother, Irene, distinguished herself by several successful engagements with the Arabs and barbarians, but especially by restoring peace to the Church. Tarasius had accepted the patriarchate on condition that an œcumeneal council should be con-

voked to re-establish the veneration of sacred images. This council, held at Nice, was presided over by the legates of Pope Adrian I. The emperor and his mother subscribed to the decrees (787).

FRESH COMMOTIONS.—On coming of age Constantine imprisoned his mother in a palace, and mutilated his four uncles, putting out the eyes of one and tearing out the tongues of the others. The ambitious Irene soon regained the upper hand. Her son having fallen into her hands, she had his eyes put out and then reigned alone. It was at this time thought that the East and the West might be reunited by the marriage of Charlemagne and Irene, but the latter was dethroned by Nicephorus, who revived every heresy, even the Manichean abominations, in which he took part. This emperor was crushed with all his army by the Bulgarians, whose king, Crum, made a cup of his skull. Michael I., son-in-law of Nicephorus, restored peace ; he would have wreaked vengeance upon the Bulgarians, but he was betrayed by Leo the Armenian, who succeeded him (813). The new emperor renewed the iconoclastic persecution with all the fury of the first Isaurian emperors.

Such are the sad alternations that are presented to us during those two centuries by the empire of the Byzantine Cæsars, wherein Christianity was left at the mercy of an absolute despotism and an unsettled succession.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION.

Humbled in the East by Mohammedanism and heresy, the Church is consoled in the West by the conversion of Germany and the thoroughly Christian civilization of the Carlovingian Empire.

## SOCIAL INFLUENCE OF THE POPE AND THE BISHOPS.

—While the Mohammedans were reaping the poisonous fruits of their civilization, and the Byzantine princes labored to deprive their own empire of its splendor, extent, and Christian life, the Catholic Church beheld the authority of her pontiffs growing in the West. And this authority was exerted in favor of evangelical preaching and piety, and for the firm establishing of true civilization. Temporal independence and the pomp of state were necessary to free the popes from Greek politics, and to enable them to treat with kings and to ensure the respect of the German races. Providence offered them these advantages through the errors of the Greek Cæsars, as well as the filial respect accorded him by the nations and princes of the West. Monothelite knavery and imperial cowardice in face of the crescent, as well as the encouragement given to the ravages of the Lombards in Italy by the fury of the iconoclasts, had estranged the Romans from Constantinople, for they saw that the pontiffs were their best defenders. The piety of the Anglo-Saxon kings, the Lombards' fear of the popes, and especially the generous support of the Frankish princes, ended in securing sovereign independence to the Papacy. Thenceforth and for a long while kings were consecrated, advised, and

warned by the popes, and the royal influence was used to spread the Gospel and to enlighten the nations. The Papacy entered on a new phase; a glance reveals the immense difference between the eight glorious pontiffs that illustrated the first century of temporal independence (715-816) and the twenty-four of the preceding century (605-715), who had been either the docile subjects or the victims of their masters, the emperors.

The bishops grew in power as well as the popes. They became rich and powerful lords in the state. It is true that trouble arose in France because Charles Martel bestowed benefices and ecclesiastical titles upon his warriors in recompense for courage displayed in face of the enemy ; but this abuse was soon reformed by Charlemagne, and it must be acknowledged that throughout the West the influence of the episcopate was salutary.

THE SPREAD OF THE GOSPEL IN GERMANY.—Although the Church had lost nearly all of her children in the southern countries by the wave of Mohammedanism that had passed over them, she yet found consolation in the north, which held out its hands to her. Irish monks completed the conversion of Scotland, the Hebrides, and the Orkney Islands. Chief amongst these was St. Columba (Colom Cille), who established at Iona, in the Hebrides, an abbey and college that grew to be a renowned seat of learning, and was frequented by students from all parts of the Christian world. St. Columbanus, after having founded Luxeuil, near Besançon, in France, labored zealously in evangelizing the Germans of the neighborhood. One of his disciples, St. Gall, penetrated the mountains of Helvetia, and there founded a mon-

astery which became the nucleus of the flourishing canton of St. Gall. He is known as the "Apostle of Switzerland." Another of these Irish monks, St. Kilian, preached the Gospel in Bavaria and Franconia, and suffered martyrdom for the faith. St. Albert, or Adalbert (Ailbe), abdicated his archiepiscopal see of Cashel, and along with St. Erhard (Erard), by some stated to be his brother, planted the seeds of religion at Ratisbon. Noble Franks left the court of their kings to evangelize these idolatrous countries. They worked in generous rivalry with the Irish and the Anglo-Saxon monks.

The Franks, SS. Emmeran and Corbinian, completed the conversion of Franconia and Bavaria, and the former even reached the country of the Avari. SS. Eloi, Amand, and Vulfran converted Belgium and preached in Friesland, which, with its duke, Radbod, opposed the Gospel as strenuously as Saxony under Witikind, but at last yielded to the heroic exertions of the holy Anglo-Saxon monks Wilfrid, Willibrord, and Winfrid. Willibrord, who afterwards baptized Pepin the Short, founded the bishopric of Utrecht, and prepared the way for the conversion of Denmark by purchasing thirty young Danes, who were to become the apostles of their countrymen. Winfrid, known as St. Boniface, spent forty years in founding schools, churches, and bishoprics in Friesland, Hesse, Thuringia, and even Saxony. He consecrated Pepin the Short, and soon sealed with his blood the faith he had preached with so much success. Charlemagne alone was enabled to perfect the conversion of Germany by the subjection of the Saxons. Thus was the way opened to the apostles of Scandinavia and of the Slavonian races.

**THE CHRISTIAN LIFE OF THE CONVERTED BARBARIANS.**—The principal mission of the Church is to develop the Christian life in her children. It is to her constant efforts that we are indebted for Western civilization. Sanctity shone from the throne as in the preceding epoch. Alphonse the Chaste, Ina of Wessex, Sigebert II., Bathilda, and many of the descendants of Blessed Pepin of Landen were models of virtue. Everywhere monasteries were multiplied. They taught labor and literature, trained and sent out apostles, and served as a retreat for kings. Four Anglo-Saxon kings became monks, as also Carloman, brother of King Pepin, and Ratchis, King of the Lombards. Many princesses imitated the pious queen, St. Bathilda, who founded the monastery of Chelles and withdrew to it for the remainder of her days. These noble examples were certainly not without influence.

The clergy gained much by the rapid extension of the regulations drawn up by St. Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz. The capitulars of Charlemagne, the numerous councils, as well as the cathedral and abbey schools contributed to afford the people wholesome examples, wise teaching, and general enlightenment.

**SCIENCES, LETTERS, AND ARTS.**—In the East the seventh century produced scarcely anything save the writings of the Patriarch St. Sophronius, of Jerusalem, and the Abbot St. Maximus, of Constantinople, against the Monothelites. But in the seventh century the violence of the iconoclasts brought about a reaction and won for the Church the letters of St. Theodorus Studita, the controversies of the Patriarch St. Nicephorus, the historical writings of St. Theo-

phanes, and the treatises of the erudite doctor St. John Damascen.

In the West, Spain and France, in the seventh century, produced the learned works of St. Isidore and the writings of SS. Ildefonsus, Eloi, and Ouen; but for nearly a hundred years afterwards these countries contributed nothing to letters, either sacred or profane. In Spain this was owing to the Arabian invasion, and in France, no doubt, to the decline of the Merovingian kings, and particularly to the possession of nearly all the episcopal sees by the unlettered heroes of Charles Martel's army. Italy, and even Rome, seemed to undergo a like eclipse from the death of St. Leo II. (683) to St. Gregory II. (715). On the other hand, England, during the same time, beheld the erudite Greek monk Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, and his friend, the Abbot Adrian, founding schools of theology, mathematics, and the classical languages, among whose pupils were Benedict Biscop, Venerable Bede, the wisest man of his time, Egbert of York, and Alcuin, who, supported by Charlemagne, made literature, science, and the liberal arts flourish in France.

The names of Charlemagne and Alcuin are inseparable from those of Peter of Pisa, Paul Warnefried, Leidrode, Theodulph, Eginard, and so many other illustrious men who graced the Palatine Academy before contributing to the erection of thousands of schools throughout the length and breadth of the vast empire of the Franks. In these schools was taught first the *trivium* (grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric) and then the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music). Together these constituted the “seven liberal arts.” This intellectual

revival survived the Carlovingian monarchy, and was one of Charlemagne's most glorious titles to the gratitude of posterity.

NEW TRIUMPH OF THE CHURCH.—At the close of this period we have reason again to see the working of God's providence in the government of the world. The Eastern Empire had not felt the scourges of the preceding epoch, but it had, along with the southern nations, been guilty of heresies, impieties, and abominable crimes, and along with those countries it underwent the just chastisement of Heaven. Mohammedanism was the instrument of God's justice.

But while the Church lost on one hand she gained on the other. The sturdy tribes of Germany superseded the effeminate people of the East; an empire wholly Christian arose amid the ruins of the despotism of the Cæsars, and the Roman Pontiffs were secured in the full possession of their spiritual authority, which is the helm of the Church and the unerring guide of civilization.

## THIRD EPOCH (814-1073),

### *FROM THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE TO THE ACCESSION OF ST. GREGORY VII.—261 YEARS.*

The third epoch shows us the formation of feudal Europe. The vast empire of Charlemagne disappears to give place to the feudal system. This transformation coincides with the invasion of fresh hordes of barbarians. The German kings, claiming to be the heirs of Charlemagne, obtain the imperial dignity and the preponderance in Europe. In the south the empire of the Arabs is dismembered as completely as that of the Carlovingians; the Mussulmans recede before the Christians of Spain, but successfully maintain the struggle with the Greeks, who separate from the Catholic Church. The Church is consoled by the conversion of the Slavs and Scandinavians.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### **THE CARLOVINGIAN EMPIRE AND THE FEUDAL SYSTEM.**

The Carlovingian Empire is broken up first into three, then into seven kingdoms, which in turn undergo a more complete dismemberment in consequence of the feudal system.

#### **Sec. 1. The two Dismemberments of the Carlovingian Empire (843 and 888).**

WEAKNESS OF LOUIS THE DÉBONNAIRE (GOOD-NATURED) (814-840).—The unity of that empire which Charlemagne had organized and maintained, was destroyed under his feeble successors, by the assaults of a powerful aristocracy and by the inroads of fresh hordes of barbarians. Besides, an inevita-

ble cause of dissolution was the antipathy of so many races of diverse languages, manners, laws, and interests.\*

As soon as they found themselves no longer under the strong hand that had ruled them so well, the greater part revolted against the new emperor. Louis the Débonnaire, the better to ensure the integrity of the empire, made the first division among his three sons, in the assembly of Aix-la-Chapelle (817). Lothaire, the eldest, received Italy, with the expectancy of the imperial crown; Pepin and Louis got only Aquitaine and Bavaria. Bernard, the grandson of Charlemagne, and already king of Italy, protested against a division so injurious to himself, but he was compelled to ask forgiveness of Louis the Débonnaire, who ordered his eyes to be put out. The young prince died in consequence of his cruel sufferings. To stifle his remorse, the

\* The limits of Charlemagne's empire were, on the north, the North Sea, the river Eider, and the Baltic Sea; on the east the Elbe, the Saale, the Bohemian mountains, the Theiss, the Save, the Bosna, and the Narenta; on the south the Adriatic Sea, the Pescara, the Garigliano, the Mediterranean Sea, the Lower Ebro, and the Western Pyrenees; on the west the Atlantic Ocean. The frontiers were held by tributary peoples: on the east, as far as the Oder, by the Slavs (Obotrites, Wiltzes, Sorabians, Czechs, Moravians); on the south by the duchy of Beneventum and by the Basques (Western Pyrenees); on the east by the Bretons (Armorica). Charlemagne held the mastery for a few years of the Balearic Isles, Corsica, and the island of Sardinia.

Charlemagne preserved the ancient division into duchies, counties, viscounties, cantons, and tithings; but at the assembly of Thionville (806) he established a more general division by forming the three kingdoms of France, Italy, and Aquitaine for his three sons, Charles, Pepin, and Louis. The kingdom of France comprised the eight provinces of Neustria, Burgundy, Austrasia, Saxony, Friesland, Thuringia, Bavaria, and Germany; the kingdom of Italy included Lombardy, the marquisate of Treviso, the marquisate of Carinthia, or Friuli, and the administration of the possessions of the Church; the kingdom of Aquitaine embraced Aquitaine, the duchy and marquisate of Gascony, the marquisate of Spain (Barcelona) and Septimania.

emperor imposed a public penance upon himself in the assembly of Attigny. This voluntary humiliation would not have compromised his authority had he been firm enough to resist the suggestions of his second wife, the ambitious Judith of Bavaria. But a son by her, called Charles, later surnamed the Bald, received an appanage so formed as to be injurious to his brothers. The latter took up arms to maintain the division that had been made at Aix-la-Chapelle, and eventually shut up their father in a monastery (830). Their disagreement soon enabled the emperor to reascend the throne ; but he provoked a second revolt by withdrawing Aquitaine from Pepin to bestow it upon his favorite son. Abandoned by his army and falling into the hands of Lothaire, he was solemnly deposed and subjected to public degradation (833). Still the rebels were unable to agree, and their disgraceful treatment of their father excited general indignation. Louis the Débonnaire, a second time restored to the throne, undertook to confer new advantages upon his son Charles, and thus caused another revolt, in the midst of which the unfortunate prince died. He lacked no virtue but firmness, nor any science but that of government. He confirmed the autonomy of the republic of Andorra, founded by Charlemagne (790). This republic of the Middle Ages still exists and is governed by a Catholic bishop.

BATTLE OF FONTANET (841) AND TREATY OF VERDUN (843).—Three sons armed against their father and sovereign had just disturbed the empire of Charlemagne : three brothers divided among themselves were about to inflict another blow upon it, and to cause its first dismemberment. Lothaire,

having taken the title of emperor, was supported by his nephew, Pepin of Aquitaine, in his project of becoming master of all the empire. Charles and Louis combined their forces for the defence of their possessions. Having advanced to Fontanet, near Auxerre, they found themselves obliged, though against their will, to settle the quarrel by force of arms. Victory declared in their favor, and they confirmed their alliance by solemn oaths in an interview at Strassburg. The oath of Louis, couched in Romance, is the earliest monument of the French language.\* Lothaire, at last realizing his weakness, accepted propositions of peace. The three brothers, in their conference at Verdun, divided their patrimony. Lothaire, already acknowledged emperor, obtained together with Italy all the territory bounded on the east by the Alps and the Rhine, and on the west by the Rhone, Saône, Meuse, and the Scheldt; Charles received Western Gaul, and Louis, Germany. Thus out of the empire arose the three distinct nations of Italy, France, and Germany.

#### WEAKNESS OF CHARLES THE BALD (840-877) AND OF HIS SUCCESSORS; DISMEMBERMENT OF THE EMPIRE INTO SEVEN KINGDOMS (888).— Charles never possessed all Western Gaul; he was

\* “Pro Deo amur, et pro Christian populo, et nostro commun salvamento, dist di in avant, in quant Deus savir et, podir me dunat, si salvare io cist meon fradre Carlo, et in adjudha, et in caduna cosa, si cum om per dreit son fradre salvar dist, in o quid in mi altre si fazet. Et ad Ludher nul plain nunquam prindrai, qui, meon vol, cist meon fradre Carlo in damno sit”: For the love of God and the Christian people, and our common salvation, from this day forth, so far as God grants me to know and to be able, I promise support to my brother Charles, and help, and in every particular, as it is right to support a brother, as long as he does the like for me. And I will never make any agreement with Lothaire, willingly, which may be an injury to my brother Charles.

worsted by Nomenoe, who had taken the title of king of Brittany, and who transmitted it to his son with all the country he had occupied as far as the Mayenne. Pepin II., King of Aquitaine, was abandoned by his subjects because he had made an alliance with the Normans and Saracens; but this rich province remained in the power of the count of Toulouse and other independent lords. The Normans continued to ravage the coasts, and even penetrated to Paris; Charles met them with gold instead of steel, which was only an additional bait to their cupidity. This monarch, who was losing his own dominions, employed much of his time in the conquest of neighboring states. He picked a quarrel with his nephews, and seized (869) a part of the kingdom of Lothaire II., which comprised, under the name of Lotharingia, or Lorraine, the countries situated between the Saône and the Scheldt, the Jura and the Rhine. On the death of Louis II. (875), brother of Lothaire II., Charles obtained the title of emperor, but he strove in vain to despoil the three sons of his brother, Louis the German (876). When at length he was summoned to Italy to encounter the Saracens, he issued the edict of Kiersy-sur-Oise (877), in the hope of winning the lords over to his side, but he was betrayed and perished miserably in a hut at the foot of Mt. Cenis.

Louis II., the Stammerer (*le Bègue*), still more inefficient than his father, Charles, soon left the throne to his two sons, Louis III. and Carloman. These two princes, notwithstanding their courage and ability, failed in their attacks against Bo-

son, who had been proclaimed king of Provence (879). At their death there remained two legitimate representatives of the Carlovingian dynasty: their brother, Charles the Simple, still a minor, and Charles of Suabia, surnamed the Fat, a son of Louis the German. The Suabian was chosen (884) because he was the only one able to govern by himself; he already bore the title of emperor, and was master of most of the countries that had formed the Carlovingian Empire. But he had not the ability to administer so extensive a dominion. The Normans, exasperated by the assassination of one of their chiefs, laid siege to Paris (886). The city was valiantly defended for eleven months by its bishop, Gozlin, and by Eudes, Duke of France, when Charles the Fat appeared at the head of a considerable army. Instead of attacking the pirates, he induced them to retire by paying them seven hundred pounds weight of silver and gave them leave to ravage Burgundy.

Cowardice so unbecoming an emperor excited the contempt of all minds, whether French, Italians, or Germans, and Charles the Fat was deposed at the diet of Tribur (887). He died soon after of poverty and grief (888). The empire of Charlemagne, after having been successively weakened by his son, divided amongst his grandsons, and left a prey to barbarians, was at last made into seven kingdoms: 1, the kingdom of Germany, under Arnulf of Carinthia, a natural son of Carloman of Bavaria and nephew of Charles the Fat; 2, the kingdom of France, under Eudes, Duke of France and Count of Paris; 3, the kingdom of Italy, under Guy, Duke of Spoleto, whose rival

was Berenger, Duke of Friuli ; 4, the kingdom of Provence, or Cisjurian Burgundy, under Louis the Blind, a son of Boson ; 5, the kingdom of Transjurian Burgundy, under Rudolph Welf ; 6, the kingdom of Lorraine, under Zwentibold, a natural son of Arnulf ; 7, the kingdom of Navarre, under Fortunus the Monk.

These kingdoms were subdivided into a multitude of almost independent fiefs. The feudal system replaced the unity of the empire.

## Sec. 2. Feudalism in Europe.

ORIGIN OF FEUDALISM.—Kings and barbarian chiefs, on settling within the Roman Empire, divided their territory into *freeholds* exempt from dues. They were more generous in rewarding their retainers or followers than formerly in Germany. Then a war-horse or a piece of armor was the recompense of fidelity and courage ; but now lands were given them, at first called *benefices*, but after the ninth century known as *fiefs*, or *fees*. These grants were revocable at will, and imposed military service and dues in kind or in money upon the holder ; but the lords who had received benefices endeavored to secure perpetual ownership in them, free from military service or other dues.

This assumption of independence on the part of the principal chiefs was begun under the last Merovingians, but was only consummated under the feeble and improvident successors of Charlemagne. Charles the Bald favored it by the edict of Mersen, near Aix-la-Chapelle (847), and it was completely assured by the famous edict of Kiersy-sur-Oise (877). The edict of Mersen authorized freeholders, who

until then had been subject directly to the crown, to choose protectors able to defend them during the anarchy caused by civil war and the invasions of the Normans. The freeholders *commended* themselves to the most powerful lords—that is, put themselves in their service in exchange for protection. This usage (*in commendam*) transformed nearly all the freeholds into real *fiefs*, or estates held of superiors on condition of military service. In the assembly of Kiersy-sur-Oise Charles the Bald went still further. To secure the assistance of the barons in his approaching expedition into Italy, he was imprudent enough to grant them the hereditary ownership not only of the fiefs, but also of the government and public functions, which until then they had held simply as temporary commissions. This authorized all the usurpations of the barons, and rendered them at once great proprietors and sovereigns at the expense of the crown. In their domains they assumed all the prerogatives of sovereignty, such as making war, administering justice, coining money, levying imposts, and, in fact, they enjoyed all the rights that in our days belong exclusively to the government.

This accounts for the utter insignificance of the last Carlowingians, who had no attendants, authority, or estate outside the little county of Laon. The entire kingdom was divided into fiefs, each fief forming a petty state, governed by its lord, who was master both of the soil and the inhabitants.

**HOMAGE, FEALTY, AND INVESTITURE.**—The feudal contract, which of its nature was free and personal, was not supposed to exist until after the performance of three ceremonies, homage, fealty, and

investiture. First the vassal paid homage—that is, he declared himself to be his lord's man (*homme*) in return for the land which he received. Homage was liege or simple. Liege homage was paid by kneeling unarmed and without spurs, and at the same time placing the hands within the lord's while repeating the customary formula. The liege man was bound to render his lord personal military service. In simple homage the vassal had only to remain standing while the chancellor pronounced the formula, to which he signified his assent. A kiss ordinarily closed the ceremony. The vassal then pledged his fealty by laying his hand upon the Gospels and taking an oath faithfully to discharge all his duties. Finally, his lord, who was now his suzerain, gave him the investiture by handing him a branch of a tree, a clod of earth, or anything which might attest that he entered on the possession of his fief. The lord had the absolute ownership of the land, and was said to hold it in fee simple; the vassal had only a conditional right, and was said to hold a limited fee.

**FEUDAL RIGHTS.**—The lord, being sovereign of his domain, required of his vassals military service, and cited them before his tribunal to administer justice and to collect various imposts, paid sometimes in money, but oftener in kind. These rights were doubtless of great extent, but they were not arbitrary. The vassal was bound only to such as custom had established and which he had freely accepted. Even when he had to furnish extraordinary subsidies it was only in foreseen cases that had been provided for in advance; for example, when the suzerain became prisoner of war, gave his daughter in marriage, knighted his son, or set out for the Holy Land.

And it is just to add that feudal dues were light, and that many were paid by a simple expression of good-humor and of gayety. Sometimes an egg was brought in great state, bound to a wagon drawn by four oxen ; at other times the obligation was discharged by a hatful of flowers, a song, a dance, or a harlequin costume. The state, which now exercises all the feudal rights of suzerainty, is not so accommodating with its taxpayers.

**THE FEUDAL CASTLE.**—The lord's dwelling was a strong castle in the centre of his domains, sometimes on an eminence, but more often on the side of a hill. It was less a palace than a fortress, surrounded by a ditch or moat filled with water and flanked with massive towers, communicating with one another by means of the wall forming the ramparts. In the interior stood the donjon, or keep, which overlooked the other towers and the surrounding places. Posted upon the platform, the signal-man sounded the alarm with the bell or horn. Immediately the villeins, or tenants, scattered throughout the villages of the fief hastened to the fortress for refuge, and access was then cut off by raising the drawbridge and lowering the heavy iron portcullis. As the enemy approached the moats, a shower of darts was discharged upon him either through the loopholes that pierced the walls or from the summit of the towers, where the defenders sheltered themselves behind the battlements. If the enemy succeeded in reaching the foot of the ramparts, hot water and all kinds of projectiles were cast upon them from the machicolations, which were a projection of the parapet wall supported by corbels or brackets, and having apertures on the lower side. But if he gained the first

enclosure the defenders entrenched themselves in the keep ; if they could not hold this, their last resource was to escape by the immense underground tunnels which extended afar into the plain or the forest.

When a traveller presented himself at the castle gate the drawbridge was lowered for him, and he was received and entertained with the most generous hospitality. In the evening they gathered around the wayfarer in the great hall to hear the news of distant lands. If he was a pilgrim he might add pious tales ; and if a bard, he sang the lofty exploits of Charlemagne and his paladins.

**FEUDAL HIERARCHY.**—It sometimes happened that the lord, safe behind the battlemented walls of his castle, thought himself independent of all but God and his sword. But the hierarchy, or gradation of dignities, became more regular as the feudal system was better developed. Highest of all was the king, who was suzerain of all the fiefs of his kingdom ; then came dukes, marquises or counts of the frontier (*mark, marches*), counts or earls, viscounts, barons or *strong men*, finally knights, who were divided into three distinct classes. The knights-bANNERET could carry a square banner and have fifty followers, with a particular war-cry. The knights of the hauberk, holders of an estate in fee-simple, served in person with two or three pages, and wore a hauberk, which was a shirt of woven steel rings descending to the middle of the body. The knights-bachelor had no following, and bore a pennant or banner terminating in two points.

Besides the feudal hierarchy there were the classes of commoners, comprising burgesses, or citizens, who dwelt in cities and lived by their industry ; villeins,

or peasants, who cultivated the lands of their lord and were required to pay only a fixed rent ; finally, the serfs, who were taxable, and forced to labor in the service of their lord, but could be neither sold nor torn from their home and family. The Christian religion had thus won them rights unknown to the slaves of antiquity, who were absolutely at the mercy of their masters' caprice.

The Church did not escape the encroachments of feudalism. The greater part of her domains were transformed into fiefs. The bishops and abbots became suzerains, dukes, counts, or barons, having in their service vassals bound to all the duties resulting from homage. It often happened that the parish priests surrendered their perquisites as dues of a fief.

PRINCIPAL FIEFS OF EUROPE.—In the tenth century there were in France seven principal leading fiefs, conferring on their possessors the title of grand feudatories, peers, or immediate vassals of the king : 1, the duchy of France ; 2, the duchy of Normandy ; 3, the duchy of Burgundy ; 4, the duchy of Aquitaine ; 5, the county of Toulouse ; 6, the county of Flanders ; 7, the county of Vermandois. Each of these principal fiefs comprised a great number of secondary fiefs, the holders of which were known as rear vassals, or vavassors.

The duke of France having become king in 987, there remained but six lay peers. Later six ecclesiastical peers were created.

Feudalism, established in France in the ninth and tenth centuries, was afterwards introduced by the Normans into Southern Italy and into England, and by the Crusaders into all their conquests in the East.

Germany became feudal at the same time as France, and counted among her most powerful lords the dukes of Saxony, Franconia, Suabia, Bavaria, Lorraine, the count palatine, and the margraves of Brandenburg, Misnia, and Carinthia. In Italy were the duchies of Friuli and of Spoleto, the marquises of Ivrea, Tuscany, and Camerino, and the county of Tusculum, near Rome. Feudalism was never perfectly developed in Spain, Portugal, and the states of Northern Europe.

### **Sec. 3. The last Carlovingians (888–987) and the first three Capetian Kings (987–1060).**

**RIVALRY OF THE DUKES OF FRANCE AND THE LAST CARLOVINGIANS.**—After the deposition of Charles the Fat the title of king was given to Eudes, count of Paris and duke of France, who had so gloriously and successfully defended the capital. His father, Robert the Strong, had already distinguished himself against the Normans.

Eudes (888–898), having directed all his efforts against the Normans, found himself unable to withstand the strong party who sustained the rights of Charles the Simple, son of Louis the Stammerer; for the sake of peace he ceded one-half of his estates to his rival (896). Charles, soon becoming sole king, displayed neither courage nor ability against the Norman pirates. By the treaty of Saint-Clair-sur-Epte (911) he ceded to their chief, Rollo, that part of Neustria called, after them, Normandy. A king so feeble-minded before the enemy could not fail to be the plaything of his ministers and the victim of a turbulent nobility. Robert, duke of France and brother of Eudes, assumed the title of king, and lost

his life in a battle against his sovereign under the walls of Soissons. His son, Hugh the Great, who commanded under him, utterly defeated the royal army (923). The new duke of France, spurning the crown, gave it to his brother-in-law, Raoul, duke of Burgundy, who spent his reign (923–936) in warring with the Hungarians or the rebel lords.

Charles the Simple, made prisoner by the count of Vermandois, died in the castle of Péronne (929). His son, who had fled to England, was recalled and proclaimed king under the name of Louis IV., *d'Outre-mer* (“from beyond the sea”) (936–954). He boldly attempted the conquest of Vermandois and Normandy, but Hugh the Great, to whom he was indebted for the crown, foiled his plans, kept him prisoner, and took from him even the county of Laon. Not till after a solemn sentence of excommunication did the rebel consent to free the unfortunate monarch and to restore his only remaining domain. Owing to the support of the duke of France, Lothaire (954–986), the son of Louis, inherited the crown. The duke himself soon died and left his inheritance to his son, Hugh Capet. The new king had won the respect of the lords, and resolved to conquer Lorraine, which has for so long been a disputed territory between France and Germany. He marched upon Aix-la-Chapelle, where he came near surprising the Emperor Otho II. at the table. The latter, in return, advanced to the heights of Montmartre, which overlook Paris, and struck fear into the hearts of its citizens by making his entire army sing an *Alleluia* (980). Peace being established between the two sovereigns, Lothaire set himself to restore the royal authority, when he died in the flower of his age. Louis V., his only son and

successor (986–987), has been called “Sluggard” (*Fainéant*) by some historians, although he had some good qualities; however, he did not remain long enough upon the throne to win praise or censure. He died at the end of a few months, and was the last king of the Carlovingian dynasty, which had occupied the throne two hundred and thirty-five years.

ACCESSION OF THE CAPETIANS; HUGH CAPET (987–996).—At the death of Louis V., Hugh Capet, duke of France, was unanimously elected king in the assembly of Senlis. Thus, feudalism triumphed in having its most powerful representative seated on the throne. Charles of Lorraine, the uncle of Louis V., having asserted his rights with arms in hand, was imprisoned and condemned to end his days in the castle of Orleans. It was not so easy to overcome the great lords, who, although willing to accord Hugh Capet the pre-eminence, were unwilling to acknowledge his right to give them orders. Consequently he exercised full authority only in those domains which he held as duke of France. South of the Loire he was not obeyed. His policy led him to renounce his authority over the ecclesiastical benefices, and by this example to the other lords he won the support of the clergy. To make the succession to the throne surer and more peaceable than if it were left to be decided after his death by election, he had his son Robert crowned during his own lifetime. His first successors did the same, and thenceforth the hereditary transmission of the crown to the eldest son was sanctioned, not by an express law but by a usage which, finally becoming a fundamental law of the state, saved France many revolutions.

**ROBERT (996–1031).**—Robert distinguished himself by his piety and domestic virtues. When he was excommunicated for his marriage with his relative, Bertha, he separated from her and espoused Constance, a daughter of the count of Toulouse. This intriguing woman twice incited her sons to revolt against their father. But Robert easily induced them to return to their duty. At the death of his uncle Henry he took possession of the duchy of Burgundy; but his love of peace led him to refuse the crown of Italy and of Lorraine.

**HENRY I. (1031–1060); TRUCE OF GOD.**—Henry I. was hardly seated on the throne when he had to march against his brother Robert, instigated to revolt by the queen-mother, Constance. He made a generous use of his victory by pardoning his brother, and even bestowing upon him the investiture of the duchy of Burgundy. During his reign France was desolated by a horrible famine, which lasted three years (1031–1033). Another scourge not less disastrous was the violence and rapine of the barons, constantly in arms against each other. To remedy this evil the Truce of God (1041) was adopted throughout the continent of Europe. This was a solemn compact in the name of God to remain at peace during Advent, Lent, the octave of the principal feasts, and on the days consecrated to the great mysteries of religion—that is, from Wednesday evening of every week till the Monday morning following; so that during these times there was no war, whatever the rank of the combatants or the cause of their quarrel. As there were lords bold enough to defy the thunders of the Church, the Church armed all the faithful against them. In every diocese clerks and laymen

formed confraternities, wherein they bound themselves by oath to fight to the death for the observance of the Truce of God. Thenceforth there was no one so mighty as to think he might break the truce unpunished. The year before his death Henry I. had the eldest of the two sons borne him by Anne of Russia solemnly crowned at Rheims. Philip I., during his long reign, remained an indifferent spectator both of the struggle between the priesthood and the empire, and of the glorious exploits by which some of his subjects founded kingdoms in the south of Italy, in England, Spain, and Palestine.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### THE INVASIONS OF THE NINTH AND TENTH CENTURIES.

The fall of the Carlovingian Empire, like that of the Roman, coincides with the barbarian invasions. Christian Europe is attacked on the south by the Arabs, on the east by the Hungarians, on the north and west by the Normans, who make several permanent settlements in Russia, England, and in a French province called, after them, Normandy; and this last sends out the conquerors of England and of the two Sicilies.

#### Sec. 1. Invasions of the Saracens and Hungarians; *the Saracens in Italy and in France.*

The Saracens, masters of Spain and of the African coast, had easily got possession of Corsica, Sardinia, and the other islands of the Mediterranean, which became so many retreats, whence they carried fire and sword to the neighboring coasts. From Sicily they

invaded Southern Italy, which, because of the dissensions of the Greeks and Lombards, fell almost completely into their hands. The rich monastery of Monte Cassino was reduced to ashes, and the Romans themselves were unable to defend the basilicas of the apostles Peter and Paul from pillage. Again was a pope to be the liberator of Italy. Leo IV. gave an example of heroism. He put chains across the Tiber to interrupt its navigation, and walled in the Vatican quarter, since then called the Leonine City (855). His zeal was ably seconded by the Emperor Louis II., the son of Lothaire. All Italians were summoned to the defence of their country. The infidels, worsted in several encounters, and at last driven to their entrenched camp on the Garigliano (916), lost all their conquests on the Peninsula.

Their dominion lasted longer in the south of France. In the year 841 they had made themselves masters of the mouths of the Rhone. After sacking the cities of Arles and Marseilles they took up a strong position at Fraxinet, whence they extended their ravages throughout Provence, Dauphiny, and the neighboring territories (888-972).

Holding the passes of the Alps, they cut off communication between France and Italy, and captured many pilgrims on their way to Rome. The abbot of Cluny fell into the hands of these brigands, and recovered his liberty only by delivering up all the treasures of his monastery. Indignation was general, and the lords of the country, till then divided, agreed to make common cause under the leadership of William, viscount of Marseilles, who won the glorious title of "Father of his Country" by clearing Fraxinet and the Provençal coasts of the Saracens (972).

INCURSIONS OF THE HUNGARIANS INTO ITALY, FRANCE, AND GERMANY.—The Hungarians, or Magyars, came from the Ural towards the close of the ninth century, and settled with their chief, Arpad, in the valley between the Theiss and the Danube. This country, called from them Hungary, was then inhabited by a small number of the Avari. The two peoples, being of the same origin, easily blended. Arnulf, king of Germany, imprudently asked the assistance of these Asiatic hordes in his war with the Moravians, whose power seemed to menace the Germans. A single campaign sufficed the Hungarians to destroy the Moravian empire. So easy a triumph emboldened them to cross the Alps and pillage Italy. They met no obstacle, owing to the rivalry of the princes, and advanced to the south of the Peninsula, leaving ruin and desolation behind. Soon afterwards they ascended the Danube and fell upon France, committing such excesses that their common name, *ogres*, came to mean monsters of cruelty. Their ravaging bands were planning to rob Cordova of the treasures of the caliphs when they were checked and beaten in Aquitaine by Raymond, count of Toulouse (925). Germany had still more to suffer than France. The irruptions of the Hungarians continued until their disastrous defeat near Augsburg (955). Nothing but Christianity was able to tame their savage nature. Their chief, Vaïc, having been baptized under the name of Stephen, succeeded, by his great zeal, in converting all his people. The Sovereign Pontiff, as a mark of gratitude, sent him (1000) a crown with the title of “apostolic king,” which the emperors of Austria still retain. St. Stephen, successful in all his un-

dertakings, conquered Transylvania and subdued the Slavs and Bulgarians. Hungary, which had so long been the retreat of barbarians, was thenceforth the bulwark of Christendom.

**Sec. 2. Invasions of the Normans in Russia, England, and the Carlovingian Empire ; *Rollo and Normandy* (911).**

**ORIGIN OF THE NORMANS.**—The Normans, or Northmen, inhabited the country known by the ancients as Scandinavia, and now comprising the kingdoms of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Either because they were too crowded on their barren soil or were harassed by intestine struggles, they yearly set out in frail barks, which they called their sail-horses, to seek new homes. Being fearless seamen, they delighted to brave the fury of the winds and waves. “The storm,” they sang, “is at our beck ; it sweeps us whither we wish to go.” The worship of Odin fostered their warlike and venturesome spirit. The war-god prepared fights and feasts without end for his braves, which, after their death in glorious battle, they were to enjoy in his abode, called Walhalla ; but for cowards was only the table of Hunger in the house of Torment. Such a prospect, joined to the restless enterprise of the Northmen and their propensity for plunder, led them for more than a century to infest all the countries bordering on the Baltic and the Atlantic.

**RURIK FOUNDS THE RUSSIAN MONARCHY (862) ; ST. VLADIMIR (973–1015).**—The Northmen, long known by their ravages on the eastern coast of the Baltic, at length found an opportunity to make a lasting settlement. One of their chiefs, Rurik, hav-

ing aided the inhabitants of Novgorod, became master of the city, with the title of grand duke (862). He is looked upon as the true founder of the Russian monarchy. His son, Igor, annexed the city of Kief to his dominions, which he extended from the Baltic to the North Sea. Already the Russians, sailing down the Dnieper in their light barks, had reached the walls of Constantinople, and under Vladimir the Great, the grandson of Igor, threatened the capital of the East. To induce him to retreat, the Princess Anna, sister of the emperors Basil and Constantine, was given him in marriage, on condition that he would embrace the Christian religion. Enlightened by the lessons and virtues of his consort, he and a great number of his subjects asked to be baptized (988). They then burnt all the idols except the principal one, which they fastened to the tail of a horse that was beaten and driven into the Dnieper. Next day the Russians waded waist-deep into the stream, and priests ranged along the shore administered baptism. Thenceforth religion began to work a change in the manners of this barbarous race. Vladimir himself, fierce and cruel as he was at first, became so compassionate to the poor and sick that he anxiously sought them out by his servants laden with provisions of all kinds. Having seen in the Gospel the blessing promised to the merciful, he abolished capital punishment; but crime increased so rapidly that he was soon obliged to re-establish a punishment necessary to the peace and safety of society. Jaroslav or Yarosla<sup>f</sup> I., a son of St. Vladimir, gave his subjects a code of wise laws under the name of "Russian Truths." There were thenceforth in Russia three distinct classes: the boyards or no-

bles, the commoners, and the serfs. Jaroslav, having inherited his father's zeal for the Catholic religion, reigned happily, and placed his three daughters on the thrones of France, Hungary, and Norway.

INVASION OF THE POLAR REGIONS AND OF ENGLAND ; ALFRED THE GREAT (871-900).—The Northmen had pushed westward also through the polar regions to North America. After taking the Faroe Islands and Iceland they discovered Greenland, Newfoundland, and, it is believed, the continent of the New World. Having overrun a good part of Ireland and the islands around England, they landed in the latter country towards the year 830. Egbert, King of Wessex, had just extended his sway over the other kingdoms of the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy (827). This prince, reared in the court and amid the armies of Charlemagne, easily kept the Danish pirates at bay, but after his death they unceasingly renewed their descents and ravages, and ended by settling at the north of the Heptarchy in the three kingdoms of the Angles.

Alfred the Great, the grandson of Egbert, ascended the throne at the age of twenty-two, and succeeded at once in expelling the Danes from his four paternal kingdoms. This able and courageous prince possessed a wide learning, acquired in study and on his journeys to Rome and France. Either because he was unable to conceal his dislike for the coarse manners of his subjects, or because he had worn out their courage in his repeated encounters, he was soon without followers, and had to seek refuge in a desert island in Somersetshire.

A poor woodcutter received the fugitive king in his hut. Here he remained unrecognized by his

enemies, and was obliged to give himself to heavy toil. He found consolation in religion, and the cruelties of his enemies soon furnished him the means of reascending the throne. The Danes, ravaging the country with fire and sword, had at last aroused the Anglo-Saxons. Alfred secretly quitted his retreat, and summoned his warriors by sending them an arrow and a naked sword. They assembled at Egbert's Stone in the seventh week after Easter. Hard by was the Danish camp, whither Alfred repaired disguised as a harper, and while amusing the enemy ascertained their position and resources. On returning he headed his army, fell upon the Danes, cut them to pieces, and compelled their chief, Guthrun, to receive baptism and to evacuate the country south of the Thames (878).

Alfred governed wisely and vigorously. To defend his kingdom against the Danes he built fortresses and equipped a fleet, which enabled him to repulse the attacks of Hasting, the most powerful chief of the pirates. England was divided into shires, or counties, which were subdivided into hundreds, and the hundreds into tithings consisting of ten freeholders and their families. The ten freeholders were responsible for offences committed within their jurisdiction, and decided the cases that occurred in their community ; those of the communities were judged by an assembly of twelve freeholders elected from the hundred ; hence the origin, it is thought, of the English jury. Above the assembly of the hundred was that of the shire, or county, which sat twice a year and was presided over by the ealdorman, or earl, assisted by the bishop. A sheriff (shire-reeve), named by the king, protected the interests of the shire and

collected fines. The great national council, called the Witenagemot (council of the wise), was composed at first of all the freemen, and afterwards of the thanes, or most powerful lords.

Supreme in the hierarchy was the king, whose crown was both elective and hereditary in the same family, and whose power was limited by the Wittenagemot.

Alfred the Great compiled in one code all the ordinances of his predecessors, and inflicted the penalty of retaliation on dishonest judges. A chronicler records that in the space of a year nearly forty magistrates were executed for passing irregular sentences. Theft became so rare that, the king having hung up his most valuable jewels on the highway, no one dared to lay hands upon them. While inspiring his subjects with salutary fear, Alfred labored to diffuse religious instruction and the love of literature among them. Many learned men were invited to his court, and he himself was justly esteemed one of the most accomplished scholars of his age. He translated from Latin into Anglo-Saxon the *Ecclesiastical History* of the Venerable Bede, the treatise on the *Consolation of Philosophy* by Boëthius, and the *Pastoral* of St. Gregory the Great, a copy of which he sent to each cathedral. To this prince is attributed the foundation of the famous university of Oxford.

PERIOD OF GLORY (900-978), FOLLOWED BY DISASTERS UNDER ETHELRED II. (978-1016).—Edward I., surnamed the Elder, continuing the glorious work of his father, increased his territory at the expense of the Danes. His son Athelstan (924-940) completed the conquest of the three kingdoms of the

Angles by defeating Anlaf, who had brought an army of Danes or Ostmen from Ireland, and had been joined by a great number of Welsh and Scots. This bloody and decisive victory was won at Brunanburgh, and is known in the Saxon ballads as “the day of the great combat.” The Welsh and the Scots, who had made an alliance with the Danes, submitted to the conqueror. Athelstan by his wisdom and piety united all the kingdoms of the Heptarchy under his sway ; he is said to have been the first to assume the title of “king of England.” His renown spread over the continent, and his three daughters espoused Otho I., Charles the Simple, and Hugh the Great, Duke of France. The reign of his nephew Edgar was equally glorious and prosperous, owing to the influence of St. Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury ; but the accession of Ethelred II., son of Edgar, ushered in many calamities.

The Danes reappeared in greater number than before. Instead of opposing them, Ethelred purchased their withdrawal for £10,000, which only lured them back again. The tax called the *dane-gelt* (Dane-gold) thenceforth weighed on the English and offered a constant inducement to the barbarians. Ethelred thought by the use of perfidy to end the evils that were charged to his cowardice. By his orders all the Danes of his kingdom were massacred on St. Brice's day (November 13, 1002). They did not spare even the sister of Sweyn, king of Denmark, a convert to the true faith ; all her children were slaughtered before her eyes, and she died exclaiming : “God will punish you, and my brother will avenge me.”

Sweyn, burning with vengeance, soon landed on the English coast at the head of a numerous army.

To stimulate the ardor of his soldiers he unfurled his standard of white silk, on which was embroidered a crow, a national emblem of ill-omen. Three of Sweyn's sisters had made the banner during the night, and they had accompanied their work with dreadful imprecations. The vengeance was what might have been looked for from the Danish pirates ; pillage, burnings, and massacres covered England with blood and ruins. St. Elphege, archbishop of Canterbury, having refused to deliver up the treasures of his church and of the poor, was led before their chiefs in the midst of a drunken orgy. “Gold, bishop !” they cried ; “give us gold, or we shall slay you.” “I have none to offer,” replied the courageous prelate, “but the gold of the Gospel.” At these words the drunken ruffians felled him with blows and struck off his head. The cowardly Ethelred, instead of defending his subjects, tried to ransom them by paying the Danes to depart ; but Sweyn, having laid waste the country, undertook its conquest. The king of England was compelled to flee to Normandy (1013) to Duke Richard II., whose sister Emma he had married. He was recalled by his subjects, and at his death (1016) left all his rights to his eldest son, Edmund Ironside. Canute the Great, who had succeeded to the inheritance of his father, Sweyn (1014), was compelled to cede half of the Heptarchy to the brave Edmund ; but the death of his rival soon left him sole ruler of England (1017).

DANISH DOMINION (1017-1042) ; CANUTE THE GREAT (1017-1035).—Canute the Great merited his surname by his piety, wisdom, and power. After his conversion he bitterly deplored the cruelties which he

and his father had perpetrated in the struggle against the Anglo-Saxons ; he built churches and monasteries on all the battle-fields where the blood of the two nations had flowed. To cement the union of victors and vanquished he married Emma, the widow of Ethelred II.; he restored the ancient laws and suppressed all the privileges of the Danes. So great was his popularity that wherever he went the people exclaimed : “ May the blessing of the Lord be upon Canute, King of the English ! ” This prince had at one time the crowns of England, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, so that he was called “ Emperor of the North.” His humility equalled his power ; in a famous pilgrimage to Rome he was seen walking in the streets with a wallet and staff. An admirable letter addressed to his subjects informed them of his vow to observe justice and piety. He concluded by urging them to be regular in the payment of Peter’s pence. This was a tax, which he had established for the benefit of the Holy See, of a farthing on every hearth in his kingdom. One day, as Canute was walking on the sea-shore near Southampton, one of his courtiers remarked that earth and sea obeyed the king’s behest. The king, seating himself on the strand, commanded the waves to withdraw and respect the sovereign of six kingdoms ; but the tide, continuing to rise, threatened to submerge him. Then, retreating, he exclaimed : “ Behold how the sea obeys me ! Know, then, that the King of heaven alone has the right to say to the waves, ‘ Thus far, and no farther.’ ” Profoundly impressed with this thought, he had no sooner returned to Winchester than he took the crown from his head and set it on the great crucifix

of the cathedral, nor would he again wear it from that day, even during public ceremonies.

This good king's sons—Harold Harefoot (1035-1040) and Hardicanute (1038-1042)—showed themselves unworthy of the throne. The Anglo-Saxons, again oppressed by the Danes, recalled Ethelred's son, Edward, who was living in exile in Normandy.

**INCURSIONS AND PRINCIPAL POSTS OF THE NORMANS IN THE CARLOVINGIAN EMPIRE.**—In the beginning of the ninth century the Normans had made but flying descents upon the coasts of the Carlovingian Empire. Landing suddenly in an ill-defended country, they would load their ships with booty and set sail at once. The inefficiency of Louis the Débonnaire and his sons rendered the pirates the bolder, and they took up their posts at the mouths of the rivers. Usually this post was established on an island, like Walcheren at the mouth of the Scheldt and Meuse, Noirmoutiers at the mouth of the Loire, or Oissel on the Seine, near Rouen. The Normans of Walcheren ravaged all the country as far as the Rhine, and burned Aix-la-Chapelle. King Arnulf put an end to their depredations by the great victory of Louvain (891).

In the west of France the dominion of the pirates was still more lasting and calamitous. Landing in 830 on the island of Her, they burnt a monastery of Benedictines. Whilst they extended their ravages on both sides of the Loire, other marauders posted at Oissel sacked the city of Rouen. One of their most famous chiefs, Ragnar Lodbrog, boldly ascended the Seine to Paris (845). He gave up the city to fire and bloodshed before the very eyes of Charles the Bald, who entrenched himself in the abbey of St.

Denis. The weak monarch bought the barbarians with gold. Sometimes carrying their frail skiffs across land from river to river, and sometimes mounted on horses they had seized, they scoured the country, quick and terrible as lightning. At their approach all fled in dismay, bearing afar the relics of saints and adding to the litany this invocation : “From the fury of the Normans, O Lord, deliver us !” It was at this time that by the king’s orders strongholds were built on the cliffs to serve as places of refuge from the pirates.

One of the barons, however, boldly opposed them in an open campaign, and by his exploits won the reputation of a Machabeus and the honor of being the founder of a new dynasty. Robert the Strong had received from Charles the Bald, under the title of duchy of France, all the country between the Seine and the Loire. Victorious in several encounters, he thought the time had come to crush the most terrible of the sea-kings. Hasting, after pillaging Nantes, Tours, Aquitaine, and Spain, advanced by the Mediterranean to Tuscany, where he took the little city of Luna by a stratagem. The ignorant barbarian supposed it to be Rome and went no farther. Returning to France, he passed, with a small number of followers, near Brissarthe to the north of Angers. Here Robert awaited him. Hasting was defeated and sought shelter in a neighboring church ; but Robert, imprudently laying aside his armor to take repose, was attacked unawares and killed (866). This success of the Normans brought fresh ravages upon France ; the fairest provinces were changed into deserts and wild beasts again roamed over the country.

SETTLEMENT OF THE NORMANS IN FRANCE ; TREA-

TY OF ST. CLAIR-SUR-Epte (911).—The scourge ceased only with the final settlement of the Normans in France. Hasting was baptized and obtained the county of Chartres from Charles the Bald, and at once closed the Loire against his countrymen. After the heroic resistance of Eudes, Duke of France (886), the pirates of the Seine no longer dared ascend to Paris ; but one of their most formidable chiefs, called Rollo, seized Rouen, which he made his rallying point. Charles the Simple, thinking it easier to gain him over than to oppose him, held a parley with him at St. Clair-sur-Epte (911) ; he offered him his daughter Gisela in marriage, with a part of Neustria for dower, on condition that he would pay homage for this duchy, and that he and his Normans would embrace the Christian religion. Rollo consented and was baptized, under the name of Robert, with nearly all his followers. After their conversion the Normans were entirely changed in their way of living. The laws of the new duke, upheld by those of religion, gave the death-blow to rapine and violence among a people who till then had lived by murder and robbery. Under so wise and vigorous a government the face of the country was changed, and Normandy became as flourishing as the rest of France was unfortunate. This was a new foothold for the Normans, whence they sallied forth to the conquest of southern Italy, England, and the East.

**Sec. 3. Conquests of the French Normans; Foundation of the Kingdom of the two Sicilies; William the Conqueror in England (1066).**

THE NORMANS IN THE COUNTY OF AVERSA (1030) ; ROBERT GUISCARD, DUKE OF APULIA AND

CALABRIA (1059).—Forty Norman pilgrims, returning from the Holy Land, were tarrying in the city of Salerno when the Saracens arrived to levy the annual tribute on the inhabitants. The Normans, indignant at the sight of infidels oppressing a Christian people, fell upon them suddenly and cut them to pieces (1016). The account of this adventure and the display of the rich presents made to the conquerors induced many Normans to seek their fortunes in the south of Italy. The duke of Salerno, desiring to attach them to his service, gave one of their chiefs the county of Aversa (1030). This incited the cupidity of the Normans, who felt themselves able to master a country given over to anarchy. The Greeks, who were rulers of Apulia and Calabria, vainly attempted to drive the Saracens from Sicily and to extend their dominion over the Lombard duchy of Beneventum, as also over Naples and the other maritime cities which had been erected into republics.

A reduced nobleman of Cotentin, named Tancred of Hauteville, having twelve sons, sent the three eldest to seek glory and wealth in southern Italy. One of them, called William Iron Arm on account of his strength, having enlisted in the service of the Greeks, conquered the Saracens in Sicily. The promised pay being withheld, William, at the head of twelve hundred of his countrymen, risked battle with an army of sixty thousand men, and routed them near Canne (1042). The result of this brilliant victory was the conquest of Apulia. The victor died shortly after, but left brothers worthy of himself : Drogon, Humphrey, Robert Guiscard (the Prudent), and Roger.

Pope Leo IX., having made an alliance with the

emperors of Germany and the East, strove to check the progress of the Normans. He advanced in person to Civitella (1053). His troops were put to flight and he himself fell into the hands of the Normans, who cast themselves at his feet, craving his blessing and the honor of being his vassals for all the fiefs they had conquered or might conquer in southern Italy. The pope acquiesced, and, captive as he was, became the suzerain of the victors. Robert Guiscard, whose courage equalled his ability, effected the expulsion of the Greeks from Calabria. Pope Nicholas II. consented to confer upon him the title of duke of Apulia and Calabria (1059), as also that of duke of Sicily, although the island was still held by the Saracens. Robert commissioned his youngest brother, Roger, to conquer it, while he continued to extend his dominion throughout southern Italy. After driving out the Greeks he pursued them to the Ionian Islands, and even to Albania. It is said that the bold Norman contemplated the conquest of the whole Eastern empire. Robert Guiscard had already thrice vanquished the emperor Alexis Comnenus when he heard the appeal of St. Gregory VII. (1084). The sovereign pontiff, besieged in Rome by the Emperor Henry IV., found none who could liberate him but the Normans, the vassals of the Holy See. Robert obeyed in all haste, scattered the Germans, and conducted the venerable pontiff to Salerno. He was then at liberty to resume his series of successes against the Greeks, in which death alone checked him in the island of Cephalonia (1085). His youngest son, Roger Bursa, received nearly all the inheritance, and nothing was left to the eldest, Bohemond, prince of Tarentum, who in-

demnified himself by glorious conquests in the East. With William, the son and successor of Roger, was severed the direct line of Robert Guiscard (1127).

THE KINGDOM OF THE TWO SICILIES (1139).—Roger, the last son of Tancred, commissioned by his brother, Robert Guiscard, to take Sicily from the Saracens, distinguished himself by prodigies of valor. Three hundred knights sufficed him to capture the important city of Messina. It is related that, being besieged in Trani, he made a sortie against the infidels, and remained alone on the battle-field, hemmed in by a swarm of the enemy, who killed his horse under him. His strength equalled his courage, and he succeeded in extricating himself, slung the saddle across his back, and walking backwards, sword in hand, reached the city without leaving any spoil in the hands of the miscreants. After a heroic struggle of thirty years (1060–1091) Roger was master of Sicily, and took the title of “grand count.” His son, Roger II., succeeded him. Having inherited the estates of his cousin William (1127), he obtained of Pope Innocent II. the confirmation of the title of “King of the Two Sicilies,” on condition of acknowledging the suzerainty of the Holy See (1139). As he possessed all the qualifications of his father, he was so fortunate as to add to his new kingdom the island of Malta, Tunis, Tripoli, and several cities of Greece; he ruled the Mediterranean and menaced Constantinople. After the less glorious reigns of his son and grandson, the Emperor Henry VI., who had married Constance, the daughter of Roger, transferred the feudal kingdom of the Two Sicilies to the German dominion of the Hohenstaufens (1189).

By the close of the eleventh century the French

Normans, through their occupation of southern Italy, had rendered three important services to Christendom : they had defended the independence of the Holy See against the pretensions of the German emperors ; they had driven the Greeks beyond the Adriatic ; and they had flung the Mussulmans back to the African coast.

EDWARD THE CONFESSOR, KING OF ENGLAND (1042–1066) ; HAROLD, AND WILLIAM, DUKE OF NORMANDY.—Edward, called the Confessor, or the Saint, was the youngest son of Ethelred II., and, having ascended the throne of his ancestors, could not forget the hospitality of his cousin, the duke of Normandy. Gratitude naturally led him to lavish favors upon Norman lords. It is a dangerous thing for a prince to show a strong leaning towards foreigners or foreign manners ; this Edward soon found out. To be sure he displayed the most admirable virtues and an ardent zeal for the happiness of his subjects. He lessened their taxes and suppressed the *danegeft* ; he gave fresh vigor to wise laws which had seemed dead, and made no war except against MacBeth, king of Scotland, who had usurped the throne by assassination. Nevertheless, the Anglo-Saxons, partly through patriotism, partly through envy, constantly showed their dissatisfaction with the monarch's love of the Normans. Even Edward's father-in-law, Godwin, earl of Kent, who was the most powerful of the Saxon nobles, and who had pretensions to the throne, actually raised the standard of revolt. Banished to the Continent, he soon returned to England and drove out all foreigners. Robert of Jumieges, driven from the primatial see of Canterbury, was succeeded by a schismatical

prelate. Clergy and courtiers were under Godwin's evil influence. Godwin's eldest son, Harold, soon inherited his power, and at once set himself to overthrow Edward's authority. Edward the Confessor, feeling the need of a vigorous hand to hold the reins of government, solemnly designated as his successor his cousin William, duke of Normandy. But scarcely had he breathed his last when Harold, aided by numerous adherents, had himself proclaimed king of England (January, 1066).

William, originally called the Bastard because he was the illegitimate son of Robert the Magnificent, or the Devil, had held the duchy of Normandy for thirty years. In his youth he had shown sufficient spirit to control his rebellious barons and to face the king of France. His ambition equaling his abilities, he had always aspired to the throne of England. Harold the Saxon, who was William's only rival, had by a solemn oath renounced all claims to the English throne, and pledged himself to uphold the Norman duke's right of succession. William's vexation was extreme when, by the same courier, he learned the news of Edward's death and of the accession of Harold. He at once made known his determination to punish the perjury. At his appeal a multitude of Normans and of adventurers from every land flocked to his standard. Pope Alexander II., acknowledging the legitimacy of his claim, sent him a blessed standard and placed his expedition under the patronage of St. Peter.

**BATTLE OF HASTINGS (OCTOBER, 1066); WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR.**—William, sailing from St. Valéry, on the Somme, with a fleet of 1,400 vessels and an army of 60,000 men, landed at Pevensey, in the county of

Sussex. As he set foot on shore he stumbled and fell. Perceiving that his companions looked upon this as a bad omen, "What is the matter with you?" said he, rising. "I have just seized this land with both hands, and, by the splendor of God, it shall all belong to you." Harold was in another part of the island engaged in a struggle with one of his brothers, who was supported by the Norwegians, but he arrived soon after, exhausted with fatigue, at the head of his victorious army. The Anglo-Saxons fought on foot with battle-axes and kept close to their leader; the Normans fought on horseback, wielding the lance or the sword with equal skill. Besides, the Normans had confidence in the justice of their cause against an excommunicated enemy, and they had spent the night in religious exercises; while the Anglo-Saxons, with their national love of strong drink, were revelling till the dawn of the day that was to decide the fate of their country. William, taking Heaven to witness the justice of his cause, had his troops blessed by his brother Odo, bishop of Bayeux, and then led them against the enemy, intoning the famous song of the paladin Roland. This was the first time that the Saxons had heard the Normans' terrible war-cry of "Ho! Rou" (Rollo), not unknown in Ireland even now by the descendants of those same Normans. The Saxons, entrenched behind a palisade, opposed an invincible resistance; but William, by a simulated flight, drew them into the plain and cut them to pieces. So ended one of the bloodiest and most decisive battles of the Middle Ages. It was fought at Senlac, near the village of Hastings. Next day Harold and his two brothers were found among the slain. The conqueror at once occupied

Dover to ensure his communication with France, and marched to London, where he met no resistance, and was crowned king of England in the church of Westminster (December 25, 1066).

#### NORMAN ROYALTY AND FEUDALISM IN ENGLAND.

—William, having won a kingdom in a day, could ensure its possession only by depriving its inhabitants of every means of resistance. To keep the Londoners in allegiance he built the strong fortress known as the Tower of London. All the kinsmen of Harold were vigilantly guarded, but they at last escaped, and, profiting by the absence of William in Normandy, concocted a great conspiracy. It is said, though perhaps without truth, that William's absence was contrived as a temptation to revolt, which might offer a plausible excuse for wholesale confiscation. During the religious exercises of Ash Wednesday all the Normans were to fall under the blows of the Saxons. William hastened back to England and ordered the massacres of Oxford and Exeter. But the insurrection continued, and Hereward, a Saxon thane, assembled a multitude of the rebels on the Isle of Ely, north of Cambridge. This was called the "Camp of Refuge." William attacked them here, and the Saxons, terribly straitened, appealed for aid to the Danes and Scots. William paid the Danes to retreat, made the king of Scotland his vassal, and destroyed most of the champions of Saxon independence. The survivors fled to the depths of forests, and under the name of "outlaws" made themselves notorious as brigands.

William the Conqueror as soon as possible hastened to make use of the supposed right of the conqueror to the goods of the conquered, and confiscated the whole

land for his own benefit. After seizing more than fourteen hundred estates, which he parcelled among his followers, he retained for himself the chief proprietorship of six hundred baronies, which comprised 62,500 knights' fees of one hundred and twenty acres each. The register of all the lands, drawn up with extreme care, was deposited in the treasury of Winchester Cathedral. The Normans called this register the *Land Book*, or *Royal Book*, but the Saxons, in bitter pleasantry, named it the *Book of the Day of Judgment*, or *Doomsday Book*, and by this latter name it is best known. Feudal rule, military in its regularity, gave almost absolute authority to the king. Besides reviving the ancient taxes, even the *danegeلت*, William ordained the curfew (*couver-feu*), which required all lights and fires to be extinguished at eight o'clock in the evening at the signal given by the curfew-bell. A law was passed which made the inhabitants of a village or hundred in which a Norman was found murdered liable to a fine, unless the murderer was produced within eight days, or unless it was proved that the murdered man was an Englishman. This law was rigorously enforced ; it became known as the "presentment of Englishry." It was also enacted that no language but the Norman—a dialect of French—should be employed in the public transactions. This was intended to destroy the Anglo-Saxon tongue. William's government had the support of the clergy, who had received rich endowments and an independent jurisdiction. The celebrated Lanfranc, nominated archbishop of Canterbury, introduced wise reforms into the English Church. This was one of the benefits of the Conquest, which besides put the country in a defensible position against

the Danes, and introduced the humanizing influences of continental civilization amongst a people who still retained many of the barbarous, not to say disgusting and brutal, manners of their ancestors.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### GERMANY AND ITALY.

From the dismemberment of the Carlovingian Empire till the Investitures (888–1073) these two countries are distinct; afterwards Germany, taking possession of the empire, subjects the Italians, and even the popes.

#### Sec. 1. The Germanic Kingdom and the Northern Races (888–962).

THE LAST TWO CARLOVINGIANS OF GERMANY.—While Charles the Fat passed into obscurity, his nephew, Arnulf, hailed king of the Eastern Franks by all the Germans, received the homage successively of the kings Eudes of France, Rudolph and Louis of the two Burgundies, and Berenger of Northern Italy. He repaid their homage by a brilliant victory over the common enemy. Eighty thousand Northmen, headed by Sigefried and defended by their ramparts, ravaged Lorraine and lower Germany in defiance of the feeble successors of Charlemagne. Arnulf seized his royal banner and marched to attack them near Louvain; he slew several thousand of the barbarians, pursued others, and captured sixteen standards. In the East he vainly strove to convert the Wends and to subdue the Bohemians and Moravians. Arnulf,

incensed at the resistance of Zwentibald, duke of Moravia, formed the unfortunate design of leaguing with the fierce Magyars, or Hungarians, who had just appeared in Europe. Zwentibald was defeated and the power of the Moravians humbled ; but this advantage was dearly paid for by the successors of Arnulf. This prince, feeling bound to interfere in the affairs of Italy, had himself crowned emperor of the West. But hardly had he recrossed the Alps than the Italians disowned his authority. Arnulf died soon after (899). His son, Louis IV., "The Infant," then seven years old, was at once acknowledged by the German lords, "because the Frankish kings were always chosen from the same race." Louis was acknowledged also by the two Lorraines. His youth favored the great lords, who strengthened their own authority in the provinces. At this time, too, Arpad, khan of the Hungarians, assisted by the Bohemians, hanged the last of the Moravian princes, marched against Germany, slew the dukes of Bavaria and Thuringia, and then with his hordes overran western Europe. Meanwhile Louis IV. died during his minority (911).

ELECTIVE KINGS ; CONRAD I. (911-918).—With Louis the Infant died the Germanic branch of the Carlovingians. The Lorraines fell to the king of France, who was Charles the Simple, the only direct descendant of Charlemagne. But the Germans preferred to elect a king who was bound to themselves. Conrad I. had the majority of votes. Then began the wars between the king and the great vassals, one of whom, Henry of Saxony, signally defeated the royal army ; the other, Arnulf of Bavaria, called in the Hungarians. While fighting the latter Conrad

was mortally wounded ; then, summoning his brother Eberhard, he commissioned him to bear the royal insignia to his greatest enemy, the duke of Saxony, whom alone he judged worthy the choice of the electors. Eberhard found Henry at the chase, his falcon on his wrist, hence his surname of the "Fowler." He was solemnly proclaimed king at Fritzlar by the assembly of bishops and lords in presence of the people ; he was clothed with the royal mantle, the diadem placed on his brows, and the sword of the ancient kings girded about his waist ; Eberhard then handed him the sacred lance, and was recompensed for his noble generosity by the grant of the duchy of Franconia, with the palatinate of the Rhine. Henry I. the Fowler thus became the founder of the Saxon line, which furnished five sovereigns in 106 years (918–1024).

THE SAXON FAMILY ; HENRY THE FOWLER (918–936).—The German lords had just put themselves under an absolute master. This the dukes of Suabia and Bavaria were the first to perceive ; then followed the turn of the Lorrainers, whom Henry had easily withdrawn from Charles the Simple. Then, turning his arms towards the frontiers, he founded the marches of Schleswig and compelled the king of the Danes to respect the Christian missionaries ; the marches of Brandenburg and Misnia were founded to oppose the northeastern Slavs. These marches were frontier provinces, defended at every point with strongholds, which soon attracted a sturdy people, who settled around the walls and were governed by a *marchio* (marquis). The Czechs of Bohemia, under Duke Wenceslaus, were forced to pay tribute to Henry, who had made their country a new marquisate against the

terrible Hungarians. These ravagers had imposed upon the king of Germany a truce and a tribute of seven years. The latter took advantage of the truce to summon a tenth of all the Saxons to his standard, to exercise his cavalry in tournaments, and to inure his soldiers to war, while he at the same time encouraged agriculture. The seventh year, instead of the usual tribute, he sent to Arpad's son, Zoltan, a mangy dog with ears and tail cut off. At once two Hungarian armies invaded Germany. Henry met them at Merseburg, and slew 36,000 upon that decisive day (933). The victor repaired the ruins made by the Hungarians, restored the eastern marquisate founded by Charlemagne, and endeavored to consolidate his work by securing the election of his son, Otho the Great.

**OTHO I., KING OF GERMANY (936).**—The new sovereign began his reign by the pomp of his coronation ; the three archbishops of Mayence, Treves, and Cologne, the four dukes of Franconia, Suabia, Bavaria, and Lorraine—all were there to fulfil honorary offices held by each one. Otho was ambitious to exercise real power over all in his dominions, and to have his supremacy acknowledged by neighboring countries, with an influence equal to Charlemagne's. He made obedience certain by dispossessing either by law or by violence the former incumbents and bestowing their goods upon his near kinsmen ; by placing near each duke a count palatine charged to look out for the king's interests ; and by conferring upon bishops the temporal jurisdiction of their episcopal cities. To enforce the respect of his neighbors he avenged the death of St. Wenceslaus of Bohemia upon the person of Boleslaus the Cruel, who finally

paid homage ; he also exacted fealty of Harold, king of Denmark ; he made himself arbiter of France by giving his two daughters in marriage to King Louis d'Outremer and the duke of France. To attain an influence which might be felt throughout Europe, he took an active part in Italian affairs and received the imperial crown at Rome.

**Sec. 2. Italy and the Western Empire (888–962) ;  
the Competitors for the Empire ; First Italian  
Monarchy (888–924).**

Scarcely was Charles the Fat deposed than two Italian princes, Guy of Spoleto and Berenger of Friuli, both on their mother's side great-grandsons of Charlemagne, disputed the title of king of Italy and emperor. For a time Berenger prevailed, but he was overcome and driven away. His rival was crowned emperor by Stephen V. (891), and associated with himself his son Lambert, whom he saw crowned by Pope Formosus (894) before his own death. Soon afterwards followed Arnulf of Germany, crowned by the same Formosus and opposed to Lambert (896). Three years later the imperial throne was vacant, at which juncture Berenger reappeared, and received at Pavia the iron crown of Italy, which Louis, king of Cis-Juran Burgundy, a grandson on his mother's side of the Emperor Louis II., disputed. The latter claimant was hailed by the powerful as king of Italy, and crowned emperor of the West by Benedict VI. (900). Louis III. did not long enjoy his dignity. Berenger took him captive and put out his eyes (905). He survived this cruel torture more than twenty years, but was of little use to the empire. There then remained Berenger, who

was engaged in a struggle with the Hungarians and the Saracens, but above all with the feudal barons, who were less easily overcome than outside enemies. This prince enjoyed some intervals of prosperity ; being solemnly crowned emperor by John X. (915), he accompanied that pope, with all the Italian lords, to the Garigliano, where he utterly defeated the fierce Saracens, who had occupied that post for thirty years and thought themselves invincible. Berenger would perhaps have reigned as emperor over all Italy, had not the jealous nobles whom he had enriched assassinated him on Christmas night (924).

RACES AND DISTINCT PRINCIPALITIES OF ITALY.—A really national monarchy seemed out of the question at that time in Italy. Before the tenth century neither the Ostrogoths, Lombards, nor even the Frankish Carlovingians had done anything to blend the different races of the Peninsula into one people. On the contrary, each of the conquerors had done his best to widen the difference between races and provinces. The dukes of Friuli and Spoleto, the marquises of Ivrea, of Tuscany, and of Camerino, the princes of Beneventum, of Naples, of Capua, and of Salerno, cared only to be absolutely independent, even of the emperors of the West. The Greeks of Bari, Tarentum, and the southern coasts obeyed none but their *catapan*. Some parts of the western coast and all Sicily belonged to the Saracens. A small number of cities, as Pavia, Milan, Pisa, alone acknowledged the king of Italy ; Rome and the cities of the patrimony of St. Peter paid no obedience to the emperor until he had been crowned by the sovereign pontiff. Even in these cities, and in Rome itself, strongholds were erected in which dwelt

tyrants who oppressed the popes and thrust their creatures, their near kinsmen, or their youngest children into the chair of St. Peter.

Providence permitted these trials to show that the government of the Church depends, not like others, upon the virtues or vices of its representatives ; it has also permitted, nay, willed, that the popes should in some way enjoy an independence that would entirely remove them from all mistrust.

**THE ITALIAN MONARCHY DURING THE VACANCY OF THE EMPIRE (924-962).**—To rid themselves of the Emperor Berenger the Italian barons had appealed to Rudolph II., king of Trans-Juran Burgundy, who helped them against the Hungarians. Having hailed him as king of Italy, they regretted their choice, and within two years set up Hugh, administrator of Cis-Juran Burgundy. It was not long till he was more hated than his predecessors. But they could not so easily dispose of him. They recalled Rudolph and fomented insurrection, but for twenty years Hugh ruled Italy with a heavy hand. At last Berenger, Marquis of Ivrea, whose mother was daughter to the Emperor Berenger, succeeded after several attempts in winning the agreement of a great number of the barons, bishops, and cities in his support. Hugh then consented to abdicate the throne, but not unconditionally. “I have done much evil,” said he in the assembly of Milan. “I no longer merit the honor of ruling you ; but behold my son Lothaire, of whom you cannot complain.” This unexpected appeal set aside the claims of Berenger, who was appointed tutor of the young king. Lothaire and his consort, Adelaide, daughter of Rudolph II., received the iron crown (945). The death of Lothaire five

years afterwards raised suspicions of poisoning against Berenger II., who, causing himself to be proclaimed king, began to ill-treat Adelaide because she courageously refused the hand of his son Adalbert. Despoiled of her possessions, dragged by horses, shut up in a strong castle, this virtuous queen excited the sympathy of the Italians and found an avenger in Otho the Great, who crossed the Alps to her rescue.

### Sec. 3. The Empire of the West transferred to the Kings of Germany (962).

INTERVENTION OF OTHO THE GREAT IN ITALY (954).—Otho aimed to imitate Charlemagne. Indeed, there was something analogous in the circumstances of these two princes when crossing the Alps : both were already famous, powerful, and respected at home ; both came as liberators ; both were to be crowned by the pope emperors of the Romans after an interregnum in the Western Empire. In his first journey to Rome, Otho, four years a widower, espoused Adelaide, and together they were crowned at Pavia. But a formidable opposition broke out in the family of Otho, so that after leaving the title of king of Italy to Berenger II. and his son Adalbert, on condition of a slight homage, he made haste back to Germany to attack his rebel son Ludolph, his son-in-law Conrad, and his brother Henry, who had instigated the barons, and called in the Hungarians. Otho spent two years in re-establishing his authority in Germany. He diminished the power of the great vassals, increased the number of the lesser ones, and organized a powerful army. Then he marched against the Hungarians, whom he encountered August 10 (955) on the plains of the Lech, near Augsburg.

It is said that one hundred thousand Hungarians were left dead on the battle-field. This victory completed that of Merseburg. Otho was more fortunate than his father. He firmly established the eastern marquisate, known thenceforth as Austria, and which the Hungarians refrained from crossing. A victory over the Slavs of the Elbe secured his northern frontier. His embassy to the caliph Abd-er-Rahman III. softened the lot of the Spanish Christians under the Ommiades of Cordova, and recalled memories of Charlemagne and Harun-ar-Rashid.

**OTHO CROWNED EMPEROR OF THE ROMANS (FEBRUARY 2, 962).**—Octavian, the son and successor of Count Alberic of Tusculum, and already master of Rome with the title of patrician, on the death of the venerable Agapetus II. had himself elected pope under the name of John XII., being the first pope that changed his name on his accession. All of his successors have followed his example in this. This pope was young, and perhaps on changing his name and dignity still retained the thoughts and manners of a secular prince. Be this as it may, the internal government of Rome was greatly benefited by his administration. The pope wished to extend these benefits of his administration to all the duchy of Rome, to the Pentapolis, and to the exarchate; but Berenger II. occupied the two last-named provinces, menaced Rome, and oppressed the rest of Italy. John invited Otho to Rome to receive the imperial crown and to deliver the Holy Church. Lords, bishops, and abbots joined their supplications to the pope's. Otho hastened to Milan, where Berenger and his son Adalbert were formally deposed. Then he

made his entrance into Rome. The Romans swore fidelity to Otho. John XII. promised not to contract an alliance with the enemies of the emperor. The emperor, for himself and his successors, renounced all claim to interfere in the jurisdiction of the Holy Roman Church, and solemnly promised to abstain from it, “unless required by him who at the time holds the government of the Holy Church.” Otho was then crowned emperor, being the first who held the title since Berenger II. (962). Thus was the Roman Empire a second time renewed in the West after a vacancy of thirty-eight years. From France and Italy it passed to Germany, where it existed till the opening of the nineteenth century (1806).

**CONFLICT BETWEEN THE POPE AND THE NEW EMPEROR.**—No sooner had Otho left Rome than John broke his oath and took part with Berenger. The emperor immediately returned to Rome and John fled. The Romans were forced to take a new oath not to acknowledge any pope but such as should hold the see at the will of Otho. A council was held at Rome, to which John was summoned, but refusing to appear, was accused of several crimes, condemned and deposed. This proceeding was certainly uncanonical and invalid. Otho had Leo VIII. elected to the papal chair and again left Rome. John immediately returned to his see and took vengeance upon his opponents. He died soon after, *some say in the very commission of a crime*; but this is now generally rejected by all impartial historians as the invention of his enemies. The Romans, far from acknowledging the anti-pope, elected Benedict V.; but the emperor, returning to Rome, exiled Benedict to Germany and reinstated Leo, who died soon after.

Otho gave him as successor John XIII., whom the Romans expelled, regardless of the emperor's vengeance. The latter had returned to Germany after casting Berenger into a dungeon and putting Adalbert to a shameful flight; but the imperial army nearly perished by an epidemic while on its march. Otho returned with a new army to Italy to avenge John XIII., to crown his son emperor of the West, and to secure for him the hand of the Greek princess Theophania. He returned to Germany and died soon afterwards (973).

Otho merited his surname of Great by his brilliant talents, valor, firmness, and his zeal for religion; but, unhappily, his ideas of religious duty were at fault in the essential point of the sovereign pontiff's authority.

**SON AND GRANDSON OF OTHO (973-1002).**—Notwithstanding the disturbances of Henry, duke of Bavaria, and the claims of Lothaire, king of France, the reign of Otho II. (973-983) was marked by great prosperity in Germany. But in Italy fortune proved fickle to Otho. He had convoked at Pavia a number of the discontented nobles, and caused them all to be massacred at a banquet to which he had invited them. After this sanguinary deed, which made him hated by the Italians, he allowed himself to be led by the counsels of his wife, Theophania, who wished the Greek provinces of Italy for her dower. On this pretext he raised a small army, mostly of Italians, to seize the Greek principalities and the cities of the south. Several successes encouraged him, but a body of Saracens, in the service of the Byzantine catapan, having surprised and dispersed his troops at Basentello, near the gulf of Squillace, he

was turned into ridicule by the Italians. He refused to go back to Germany, and died in Italy of grief, or poison, after securing the election of his son, Otho, not yet four years old. The difficulties arising in Germany from the minority of Otho III., and from the accession of the Capetians to the throne of France, were settled by the Empresses Theophania and Adelaide and the archbishop of Mayence. At the age of fifteen Otho went to Rome to be crowned emperor by Gregory V., his kinsman, and the first German pope. For several years the popes had been oppressed by Crescentius, the leader of an Italian faction hostile to foreigners. A new rising against Gregory V. brought back the emperor, who seized the castle of San Angelo and put Crescentius to death. After Gregory V., Otho secured the election of the learned Gerbert, who had been one of his preceptors, and who took the name of Sylvester II., being the first French pope. The emperor entered into the broad views of the new pope, and conferred the title of king upon Boleslaus the Brave, duke of Poland, and upon St. Stephen, prince of Hungary. Perhaps he might have carried out the plan of the Christian republic, conceived by Sylvester II., had he not prematurely died when only twenty-two (1002).

**ST. HENRY, EMPEROR (1002-1024).**—German royalty, although strengthened by its assumption of the imperial dignity, remained elective by right; yet, in point of fact, it did not depart from the reigning house except in default of a direct heir. At the death of Otho III. the house of Saxony was represented by Henry, duke of Bavaria. Although his father and his grandfather, both descendants of Henry I., were constantly involved in quarrels, he

himself was conciliatory in all that did not concern religion and morals. He was elected in Germany under the name of Henry II., in spite of the opposition of two lords, who, however, soon took the oath of allegiance. But beyond the Alps, Hardoin, marquis of Ivrea, insisted upon his claims to the crown of Italy, notwithstanding he was defeated and that his rival was crowned by Benedict VIII. (1014). Hardoin died in 1015, and the emperor was enabled to curb the ambition of the first king of Poland, to favor the apostolate of the first king of Hungary, who had become his brother-in-law, and to aid the pope, with Norman help, to repulse the Saracen pirates that infested Southern Italy. The greatest glory of the emperor was won in promoting piety throughout the realm by his example and by the foundation of religious institutions, and in contributing with all his power to spread the faith among the Slavs, Scandinavians, and Hungarians.

At the opening of the eleventh century royalty was adorned with a piety equal to the other brilliant qualities it displayed. Sylvester II. was pope, St. Henry was emperor of Germany, St. Stephen reigned in Hungary, Boleslaus the Brave in Poland, Canute the Great in Denmark and England, St. Olaf in Norway, Sancho the Great in Spain, St. Vladimir was grand duke of Russia, and the pious King Robert was sovereign of France. St. Henry died 1024. His virgin spouse, St. Cunegonde, survived him.

THE FRANCONIAN FAMILY (1024-1125).—The family of Saxony ended with Henry II., having given five sovereigns to Germany, four of whom were emperors. The eight German dukes, convened in

the electoral college with their rear-vassals, spent two months in the effort to choose a king, and at last decided in favor of the least powerful among themselves. He was duke of Franconia, and bore the name of the first king elected after the extinction of the Carlovingians, Conrad. He was a descendant of a daughter of Otho the Great and a nephew of Pope Gregory V. This new family gave four emperors, and occupied the imperial throne of Germany one hundred and one years.

Conrad II. (1024–1039), surnamed the Salic, astonished his electors, for he made himself sovereign in fact as well as in name, and exacted obedience of his vassals, including the duke of Bohemia. In Italy he formally invested the first Norman count of Aversa, after receiving at Rome the imperial crown from the hands of John XIX. Everywhere he counterpoised the power of the great vassals by the perhaps excessive rights that he conferred upon the vavasors, or inferior vassals. On the death of his uncle, Rudolph III., he inherited the kingdom of the two Burgundies (1032).

The successor of Conrad II. was his only son, Henry III. (1029–1056), surnamed the Black. Though he had no competitor, he was called upon to quell disturbances in Burgundy, then recently annexed to the empire, and in Lorraine and Hungary, after which he passed into Italy, not so much to restrain the aggressive and restless Normans as to restore order in Rome. The Papacy was disgraced in the person of Benedict IX., who had been thrust into the chair of St. Peter by his relatives, the counts of Tusculum, when he was but ten or twelve years old. It is true that in 1044 Benedict abdicated a

dignity which he had dishonored for eleven years. Three claimants appeared ; two of them were declared usurpers and intruders, the third, Gregory VI., confessed himself guilty of simony and laid aside the pontifical insignia. Henry then had the bishop of Bamberg elected pope (Clement II.), and with his consort, Agnes of Poitiers, was crowned by him on Christmas day. After Clement II., the Emperor Henry III. designated Damasus II., then St. Leo, then Victor II. The choice was good in these cases, because the emperor was good. But the time was to come when in order to ensure a good choice all secular influence would have to be withdrawn from the election of the popes ; for the successor of Henry III. was his notorious son, Henry IV. Happily the celebrated Hildebrand was then cardinal, and soon became pope under the name of Gregory VII.

#### **Sec. 4. Cis-Juran and Trans-Juran Burgundy; Kings of Arles (887–1032).**

**FOUNDATION, COALITION, AND DISSOLUTION.—** Among the states formed out of the wreck of the Carlovingian empire must be mentioned the two Burgundies, at first separate and independent until 933, then united for a century only, when they were incorporated with the German empire. Cis-Juran Burgundy, comprising the valley of the Rhone, with Arles for its capital, had but three kings : Boson, a son-in-law of the Emperor Louis II.; his son, the Emperor Louis III., surnamed the Blind, from the cruelty inflicted on him by Berenger ; finally, Hugh of Provence, an usurper who, to secure the possession of Italy, basely abandoned the Mediterranean coast and the Alps to the Saracens, while he ceded

the rest of the kingdom to his rival, Rudolph II., king of Trans-Juran Burgundy (933). The latter Burgundian kingdom, founded in 888 by Rudolph Welf, comprised at first a part of present Switzerland and of Franche-Comté, but after the cession of the Cis-Juran its extent was greater, and it was known as the kingdom of Arles, without, however, attaining to great power. This dynasty offers us but four kings, the least insignificant of whom was Conrad the Peaceful (937-993). By a successful stratagem he set those scourges of his kingdom, the Saracens and the Hungarians, against each other, and then with his little army he gathered the fruits of the victory (940). The kingdom of Arles represented no distinct nationality ; its ephemeral existence, followed by a nominal submission to a foreign power, explains the rise of the sovereign counties of Savoy, Provence, Dauphiny, Neufchâtel, and the ecclesiastical principalities of Lyons, Besançon, Geneva, Basle, and St. Maurice d'Agaune.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### SPAIN, THE ARABS, AND THE GREEKS.

Heroic struggle in Spain between the Christians, who grow in power, and the Arabs, who are losing their warlike spirit and are being narrowed in their limits little by little. The Greek Christians lose all their advantages.

#### Sec. 1. Vicissitudes of the Struggle between the Arabs and Christians of Spain.

SINGULAR ALTERNATIONS.—The religious and political war of eight hundred years of which Spain was the theatre offers a singular spectacle ; for two cen-

turies great Moslem princes always appeared just when the power of the Christian princes seemed on the wane. Alfonso II., the Chaste, had just died when Abd-er-Rahman II. appeared and defeated the successors of Alfonso, retaking provinces, wresting Barcelona from the king of France, and persecuting the Christians in his dominions. Then Alfonso III., the Great (861–911), avenged his predecessors by crossing the Douro, gaining brilliant victories, which opened his way to the Tagus, fortifying Coimbra, Zamora, and Burgos. During the intervals of victories Alfonso built palaces, erected the celebrated basilica of St. James at Compostella, or wrote for the guidance of his successors the history of the heroic wars of the peninsula.

**TWO GREAT CALIPHS AND AL-MANSUR THE GENERAL.**—The Arabs had become dispirited when the brilliant Abd-er-Rahman III. (911–961) inherited the caliphate, the very year in which the great Alfonso resigned the throne to his unworthy sons. Abd-er-Rahman, victorious in the vale of Jonquera, crossed the Pyrenees, pillaged Gascony, besieged, defended, and besieged anew the stronghold of Zamora. He had met brave adversaries in the kings of Navarre, newly founded, and of Leon. This last was a new kingdom, whose rulers were the successors of Pelagius, and were generally in alliance with Navarre. The caliph found less resistance in Africa from his co-religionists. He dispossessed the Edrisites of all the country called Maghreb (Morocco and Algeria). The last twenty years of his reign he spent in peace. During this time he formed relations with the Greek emperors and with Otho the Great, enjoying his immense riches, his superb

palaces, and his glory ; realizing at the same time the nothingness of human grandeur. “ I have now reigned fifty years,” he writes in his Memorial, which has come down to us ; “ I am beloved by my subjects, feared by my enemies, respected by my allies. I have acquired and enjoyed riches, glory, power, and pleasure, and yet in all my life I can count but fourteen days of true happiness. O man ! put not your trust in this world.” This great prince needed only to be a Christian. His son, Hakem II. (961–976), greatly delighted in learning and learned men ; under him schools, the fine arts, and commerce flourished. Seeing that his subjects disregarded the Koran’s prohibition of the use of wine, he had two-thirds of the vines of Spain torn up by the roots.

FALL OF THE CALIPHATE OF CORDOVA (1031).—With Abd-er-Rahman and Hakem fell the personal power of the caliphs. But the effeminate Hesham II., or Issam (976–1008), was sustained by his brave general Mohammed, surnamed Al-Mansur or Almanzor (the Victorious), who fought and won fifty-six battles in twenty-two years. Overcome for the first time at Calatanazor by the united armies of the count of Castile and the kings of Leon and Navarre, Al-Mansur starved himself in order not to survive what he called his dishonor (998). Thenceforth intestine wars, revolutions in the palace, success of Christian armies, led to the deposition of Hesham III. and the final downfall of the Western caliphate (1031). It was prosperous almost to the verge of its destruction.

TWO GREAT CHRISTIAN KINGS AND THE CID.—The Christians in their turn flourished under two

great kings and an incomparable captain. Sancho the Great, king of Navarre (1000–1035), had by conquests and alliances succeeded in uniting under his family all Christian Spain. Had this prince not divided his dominions among his four sons, Mussulman rule in Spain would have been at an end. One of his sons, Ferdinand the Great, first king of Castile (1035–1065), when dying committed the same imprudence, but at least during his thirty years' reign he had considerably extended his kingdom at the expense of the petty Mohammedan kings who shared the heritage of the Ommiades. Viseu, Lamego, Coimbra, Gormaz, and hundreds of other strongholds were taken or retaken; Zamora was fortified anew; the Moorish kings of Toledo, Saragossa, and Seville were made tributary; such were the results of the conquests of Ferdinand, of his three sons, and of Rodrigo or Ruy Diaz de Bivar, surnamed the Cid, also *El Campeador*, the Champion. This immortal hero, whom Ferdinand dubbed knight, and who was a model of all virtues, served the succeeding kings, notwithstanding their ingratitude; for almost sixty years he constantly defeated all their enemies. He ended his exploits by the conquest of the kingdom of Valencia, the possession of which was guaranteed to him as an appanage.

ANARCHY AMONG THE ARABS.—In Spain, in the place of the caliphate of Cordova, there arose a score of petty kingdoms, which were continually warring among themselves. In Africa and Asia independent dynasties were overthrowing one another or infringing upon the liberty of the inefficient caliphs of Bagdad. To increase the difficulty anti-social sects,

sword in hand, spread their abominable doctrines. The Karmatians, who denied a future life and professed the most brutal communism, lorded it over Arabia during a century ; their chief, taking possession of Mecca, slew fifty thousand inoffensive inhabitants and carried away the black stone ; in order to pollute the temple he interred three thousand corpses within it (929). The secret society of the Ismailians, whose maxim was “Nothing is true and everything is lawful,” shielded themselves under the name of Fatima, the daughter of Mohammed and wife of Ali ; this sect had established a separate caliphate at Cairo. One of their caliphs, Hakem (996–1021), went so far as to have himself adored as God ; after his death his worshippers were known as the Assassins of the Mountain, and are at present represented by the Druses of Lebanon. Anarchy was rampant among all the Mohammedans. Soon, however, the western Arabs received a temporary impulse from the Almoravides and Almohades. The eastern Arabs, too, were reanimated by the Turks who, just before the Crusades, infused fresh energy into Islam.

## Sec. 2. The Greek Empire; *Photius and Michael Cerularius.*

**POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS WEAKNESS IN THE EAST.**—The Greeks might have profited by Moslem decline to recover their former provinces, and regenerate them by Christianity. The Kazares were their faithful allies ; the Bulgarians were just embracing Christianity ; the Hungarians were gone to ravage the western parts of Europe. But the Greeks were given up to dynastic revolutions, their emperors were rarely men of ability, and the little of Christianity that re-

mained, far from benefiting those outside of the empire, was degenerating into heresy, corruption, and at last into that unhappy schism which engulfed the whole nation.

HERESY SUCCEEDED BY SCHISM; PHOTIUS.—As soon as the orthodox prince Michael I. was deposed (813), the senseless heresy of the Iconoclasts revived under Leo the Armenian, Michael the Stammerer, and Theophilus. The rude hand of the Mohammedans, in the war of Armorium, was the instrument of Heaven's vengeance on the latter prince. His widow, Theodora, imitating Irene, restored peace to the Church with the help of the pious patriarch Ignatius, a son of the Emperor Michael I. But Theodora beheld the growth of a monster in her son Michael III. (842–867), justly surnamed the Drunkard, and notorious for cowardice, his love of the circus, and his utter disregard and disrespect for everything holy. He had been drawn into his evil course by his uncle Bardas; both were fit agents to plunge the hapless church of Constantinople into still greater misfortune than it had yet undergone. Theodora was exiled; Ignatius deposed and succeeded by the eunuch, Photius, doubtless the most learned man of his age, but also the most crafty, the most courtly and ambitious. This man, in disregard of the canonical rule, and without even the form of an election, was consecrated by the bishop of Syracuse, and took possession of the patriarchal chair of Constantinople on Christmas day (857). The great Pope Nicholas I. protested against the intrusion; Photius attacked the Roman Church, reproaching it with having inserted a word (*filioque*) in the Creed, tolerating fasting on Saturdays, using strangled meats, and other

irregularities of this nature. He was anxious to divert attention from his usurpation, but the pope continued his protest; still the pontifical complaints were not heeded till after the assassination of Bardas and Michael by Basil the Macedonian, who reinstated St. Ignatius, imprisoned Photius, and convoked an œcumeneal council (869–870) at Constantinople, by the authority of Adrian II. Unfortunately, Basil allowed himself to be flattered by Photius, who had forged a pedigree in which the low-born emperor figured as a descendant of Tiridates, King of Armenia. After the death of Ignatius, Photius, more arrogant than ever, was again placed in the patriarchal see, whence he was again driven out by the Emperor Leo the Philosopher, the successor of Basil.

THE MACEDONIAN DYNASTY (867–1057).—The son of a Macedonian farmer, Basil was the founder of a dynasty which occupied the throne for two hundred years. Basil I. repaired the disorders of the preceding reign; he also gained several advantages over the Saracens in Asia, and spread the terror of his name as far as the Euphrates. But a century passed before one of the family, Basil II., proved worth of such an ancestor. And these two alone of that family were worthy to wear the crown. Leo the Philosopher and Constantine Porphyrogenitus, a son and grandson of Basil I., studied, spoke, and wrote much concerning laws (*basilicas*), administration, military tactics, and diplomacy, but governed ill, and were unable to defend the empire against the Arabs, Bulgarians, and Russians. If these enemies were oftener disarmed by gold than with steel the fact must be attributed to Romanus I., Lecapenus,

the father-in-law and colleague of Constantine. Their successor, Romanus the Younger, a parricide and debauchee, had excellent generals in the two Phocases. His children were Basil II., Constantine VIII., Theophania, who married Otho II., and Anna, who, by marrying St. Vladimir, contributed much to the conversion of the Russians.

TRANSIENT SPLENDOR OF THE GREEK EMPIRE (963-1019).—The general Nicephorus Phocas had retaken the Island of Crete from the Saracens during the reign of Romanus II. While Basil and Constantine, sons and successors of Romanus, were in their minority he had roughly handled the Bulgarians, and, carrying the war into Asia, had vanquished the Saracens. Proclaimed emperor (963) along with the two young princes, he conquered the island of Cyprus, Cilicia, and a part of Syria as far as the Euphrates, while his general, John Zimisces, seized upon Antioch. The latter, profiting by the murmurs against Nicephorus, assassinated him, usurped the throne, and strove to obliterate his crime by a wise, firm, and glorious government. He defeated the Russians in Bulgaria; several campaigns in Syria, against the Arabs, won him the surname of Conqueror of the East. He was poisoned by a miserable eunuch (976). At last Basil II. reigned alone, unrestrained by his brother Constantine. He was at first harassed by several ambitious generals; but he put down their revolts and used their talents against the Saracens in Italy, the islands of the Mediterranean, and in Asia. He reserved to himself the war against the Bulgarians, which, after twenty years of campaigns, ended in the annihilation of the kingdom. He also took possession of the Crimea, so as to check the Russian advance in that

direction. All these countries were incorporated into the empire, which at the death of Basil (1025) was greatly extended and had recovered much of its outside splendor.

DECLINE ; MICHAEL CERULARIUS.—From the death of Basil II. to the accession of the family of Comnenus there elapsed fifty-six years dishonored by the shameful old age of Constantine VIII., by the disorders of his two daughters and their crowned favorites, by the success of the Seljukian Turks, and especially by the consummation of the schism of Photius under the patriarch Michael Cerularius. After the second deposition of Photius the union between the Church of Rome and Constantinople had been restored. But Michael Cerularius, raised to the patriarchate in 1043, allowed his narrow mind to be filled with the paltry accusations formerly levelled by Photius against the Latin Church ; and on his own part he added to the charges of Photius that of the use of unleavened bread in our holy mysteries ; he also censured ecclesiastical celibacy and the suspension of the *Alleluia* at certain times of the year. For these reasons he excommunicated the sovereign pontiff and the bishops and churches of the West. Pope St. Leo IX. despatched legates to Constantinople, where they were favorably enough received by the Emperor Constantine Monomachus. In vain they strove to win back Cerularius to better sentiments. The obstinacy and pride of the patriarch and the timid attitude of the emperor forced the legates to excommunicate Cerularius formally. They placed the act of his condemnation upon the altar of St. Sophia, shook the dust from their feet, and departed (July 16, 1054). From that day, although

several emperors, bishops, and churches have individually renewed communion with Rome, the patriarchal church of Constantinople has remained separated up to our own time.

---

## CHAPTER V.

### **THE CHURCH AND FEUDALISM; CONVERSION OF THE SCANDINAVIANS AND SLAVS.**

In spite of the embarrassments of its hierarchy the Church protects learning, completes the conversion of the northern nations, and greatly promotes the conversion of the East.

#### **Sec. 1. The Catholic Hierarchy, particularly in the Tenth Century.**

**TRIALS OF THE PAPACY.**—Till the end of the ninth century the Papacy remained on the level to which it had been raised by the new order of things and the establishment of the temporal power. The popes were independent at Rome, and there crowned the emperors, whose arm was devoted to the service of the Church against evil-doers and foreign enemies. The emperor upheld the pope and aided him, when necessary, in the exercise of his temporal power, and the pope in return lent the emperor, as occasion required, the support of the ecclesiastical censures. A striking example of the harmony between the two powers is found during the pontificate of Nicholas the Great (858–867). On the day of the enthronement of Nicholas, Louis held the bridle of the pope's horse. He compelled the Romans to submit to the pope; he attacked the Saracens that menaced Rome; he sanctioned the legates who went to Constantinople to de-

pose Photius, and those who went to forbid Lothaire to put away his lawful wife. And on his part the pope sustained the emperor against all such as set his titles at naught, or who encroached upon his rights over Provence and Lorraine.

But after the pontificate of Formosus (896) began a long series of troubles for the Papacy; and if it came out victorious it was solely because it is of divine institution. The temporal privileges of the sovereign pontificate aroused the envy or the greed of the more powerful families who were desirous to place their own children in the apostolic seat; the weakness, discredit, or suspension of the imperial power favored the establishment, even in Rome, of an overreaching feudalism which affected the papal elections; while later the too officious intervention of the German emperors in the choice and the spiritual government of the popes contributed but seldom to the general good of the Church, to the reform of abuses, or to the splendor of the Papacy. It is true that to these emperors was due the elevation to the chair of St. Peter of a Gregory V., a Sylvester II., a Leo IX. But it was through their influence, too, that popes were made who were at least as unfit as those for whose choice the marquises of Tuscany and the counts of Tusculum are answerable. Yet this evil influence of princes and royalty did not prevent the nomination of saintly popes like Leo VII., Stephen VIII., Agapetus II. God watched over his Church in the tenth century as he does in our own.

**THE NEW MANICHÆANS.**—One of the most evident marks of the special providence watching over the Church is that during the ninth century, so decried by certain authors, no new heresy is recorded.

Even the schism of Photius was lulled. True, the ancient, hideous heresy of the Manichæans continued to spread quietly after the manner of a secret society. The infamous progeny of Manes and of the Mohammedan sects were prosecuted in Asia Minor in the ninth century, but evaded the law and disguised themselves under the name of Paulicians. But in the tenth century they appeared in Europe—first in Bulgaria. They soon infested the centre and the north of France, where they corrupted morals and railed against the hierarchy. Later they appeared in the south of France under the name of Albigenses; but their very excesses were the occasion of a renewal of rigor in ecclesiastical discipline, and a more faithful observance of the ancient canons.

**ABUSES AMONG THE CLERGY.**—The great prelates, bishops, or abbots, having become temporal lords, bound by liege homage to a lay suzerain and to certain civil and political functions, being, moreover, mostly scions of noble houses, were but too liable to give themselves to a secular life, to the serious injury of their pastoral charge. For this reason ignorance, vice, and abuses crept in amongst the inferior clergy, and even into such monasteries as had been spared by the Saracens, Normans, and Hungarians. Prelates accompanied their prince to war, to court, and to the chase. They thought it no shame to buy the riches, immunities, and rights attached to a prelacy. But little thought was given to fitness or vocation. Simony drew in its train all vices, particularly ignorance and license. These scourges were felt more or less by France, England, Germany, and all the west, except Spain, which underwent other trials. But it was Italy that suffered the most from these

terrible abuses, and from there came the loudest and most bitter complaints.

HOLY PERSONAGES ; THE ABBEY OF CLUNY (910). — Meanwhile no Catholic country was totally deprived of examples of sanctity. Italy herself in the tenth century was the admiring witness of the virtues of St. Nilus of Calabria ; St. Romuald, founder of the Camaldoli, and St. Peter Orseolo, doge of Venice ; soon followed St. John Gualbert, St. Peter Damian, St. Leo IX., St. Gregory VII. Germany had St. Matilda and St. Adelaide, on the imperial throne ; and close to the throne St. Bruno, St. Wolfgang, and St. Ulrich, with whom began papal canonizations as practised to our own time. Germany, too, sent apostolical men to the northern nations. England, though incessantly harassed by the Danes, could boast of St. Dunstan of Canterbury, St. Oswald of Winchester, and the Chancellor St. Turketul. France had witnessed in 875 the extinction of the last representatives of the age of Charlemagne. But in 910, through the munificence of William the Débonnaire, duke of Aquitaine, the pious Abbot Bernon founded the famous Abbey of Cluny in a lonely valley of Mâconnais. This abbey was destined to become a school of learning, and a nucleus of wide-spread reformation for hundreds of monasteries, thousands of prelates, and the Catholic world at large. The successors of Blessed Bernon, St. Odon, St. Aymar, St. Odilon, and St. Hugh had great influence through their virtues, talents, and acquirements. From Cluny went forth Abbot William, who reformed the monasteries of Normandy, and Abbot Richard, who did the same for the monasteries of Lorraine. Hildebrand sanctified

himself at Cluny before returning to Rome with St. Leo IX., to reform the Church and to sanctify the world.

LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART; GERBERT.—The Church showed herself during this epoch more than ever the asylum, the protectress, and the mother of useful knowledge. With few exceptions the illustrious men of the time were churchmen, as Abbon of Fleury, Flooard of Rheims, Ditmar of Merseburg, Witikind of Corwey, Luitprand of Cremona, all respectable historians. St. Odo, abbot of Cluny, and the Italian monk, Guido of Arezzo, wrote on music. The latter designated by points upon lines and spaces the different sounds of the octave, whose notes he named *ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la, si*, from the first syllables of the hymn of St. John Baptist.\* A German nun, Roswitha, composed dramas in Latin in imitation of Terence. But of all the authors of that age the most distinguished was Gerbert, who, from being a simple monk, became master of the royal school of Rheims, then archbishop, and finally pope—Sylvester II. (999–1003). The prevalence of crime during the preceding century, and a wrong understanding of the Scripture portents, had led many to look forward to the year 1000 as the last year of time, the year of the final judgment. As that year approached general consternation prevailed. The monasteries were overcrowded

\**Ut queant laxis  
Resonare fibris,  
Mira gestorum  
Famuli tuorum ;  
Solve pollutu  
Labii reatum,  
Sancte Ioannes.*

by terror-stricken criminals, who sought by a hurried and insincere repentance to atone for years of infamy. But Sylvester II., who was pope at that time, was free from those superstitious fears and helped to revive confidence by the calmness with which, amid the general dread, he directed the emperor, kings, and prelates. It was he who first introduced the use of Arabic figures, which he had learned from the Moors in Spain. The cruel treatment of Christian pilgrims by the Fatimite caliph, Hakem, gave this pope the idea of the Crusades a full century before they were undertaken. Speaking for the suffering church of Jerusalem, he addressed the Christian world in a celebrated letter : “The unbelievers desolate the holy places whence went forth the apostles to enlighten the world, where our Redeemer was manifest in the flesh, where he preached, suffered, and was buried. ‘His sepulchre,’ it is written in the prophecies, ‘shall be glorious.’ Soldiers of Christ, arise ! Gird yourselves ! But, if you cannot bear arms, lend the aid of your counsel and your wealth, and thereby obtain remission of your sins.” A fleet of Genoese and Pisans was organized in answer to his summons, and landed on the coast of Syria, but perished miserably.

#### Sec. 2.—Conversion of the Scandinavians; *the Providential Order of the Conversions.*

We have seen the Church during the first epoch converting all the Germans who had come down upon the Roman territories and settled within them. During the second epoch the Church sent missionaries to preach the Gospel in Germany itself, where they were protected by the Carlovingians. In the third

period the conversion of the Scandinavians, a people of Germanic origin, was effected in like manner. About the same time the Slavonic nations nearest the Christian frontiers received the Gospel, as did the Bulgarians, Hungarians, and Scythians, owing to their advantages of position. We cannot but admire the merciful dispensation of Providence that called to Christianity and civilization first the wandering and most turbulent barbarians, and then by their means those barbarians who had remained in their own country. Thus the Church recruited her ranks, repaired her losses, and diminished the evil of the invasions by evangelizing the very homes of the invaders. Once converted, these nations, previously ferocious and plunged in ignorance, set out upon a glorious career in history.

**ST. ANSCARIUS (825–865), APOSTLE OF THE NORTH.**—We have seen the Anglo-Saxon missionary Willibrord purchasing thirty Danish children to instruct them as missionaries for their own countrymen. A hundred years later Harold the Dane, with his retinue, sought baptism at Mayence in presence of Louis the Débonnaire. On his departure he took with him the learned and intrepid monk, Anscarius of Corbie, who offered himself as a missionary for the northern nations. One day while in prayer he was rapt to heaven, where he contemplated the glory of the saints, when a voice said to him: “Descend again to earth, and return not hither till thou hast won the crown of martyrdom.” This martyrdom was a mission of forty years of toil and suffering. Having, with his fellow-laborer, reached Denmark, they, after the example of St. Willibrord, bought young pagan slaves and instructed them in

the faith. Their apostolate was beginning to bring forth fruit when Harold was driven away and Denmark closed against the Gospel. Meanwhile, an imperial embassy was sent to Sweden. Anscarius joined the French deputies, converted many Swedes, and built several churches. The archiepiscopal see of Hamburg being erected, Anscarius was promoted to it, with legatine powers in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. He continued to wear coarse garments, to live poorly, and to labor with his hands for the support of his co-laborers and to procure presents for pagan princes. His perseverance was crowned with success. Eric of Jutland, who came to destroy the rising church of Hamburg, granted leave to build churches and preach the Gospel in his own kingdom. Anscarius sent his priests in all directions, and labored incessantly till his death (865).

**CHRISTIANITY IN DENMARK.**—The successors of Anscarius in the see of Hamburg inherited his zeal for the instruction of idolaters. But the princes remained pagan, and at times cruelly persecuted the missionaries. Not till the emperors had gained several victories over kings Gorm and Harold Blaatand was liberty to preach secured. Harold, having resolved to receive baptism (972), favored Christianity with all his power, but he was dethroned by his apostate son, Sweyn, who became king of Denmark, Norway, and the conqueror of England. Although his success seemed calculated to injure the cause of Christianity, it only served it; for his son and heir, Canute the Great (1014–1035), educated in England and married to the pious Emma of Normandy, was a thorough Christian, and gloried in uniting his subjects in the faith of the Catholic Church, in which

he had instructed himself while making a pilgrimage to Rome. His successors, particularly his nephew, Sweyn II., continued to defend the true faith notwithstanding the opposition of the votaries of Odin. To the insular bishoprics of Roskilde in Seeland and Odense on the island of Funen were added the continental bishoprics of Boerglum and Viborg, in Jutland, as also that of Lund, which soon became the metropolitan see of Denmark. Under St. Canute IV. (1080–1086) Christianity flourished in all but a few parts of Denmark, and in suppressing the opposition in one of these the holy king met his death by assassination.

**S**WEDEN.—The temple of Upsal was the sanctuary of the religion of Odin and the Runic mysteries. A fiendish plot was concocted there to annihilate the first mission founded by St. Anscarius. But the apostle appeared in the assembly of pagan priests, in presence of the king and all the people, and demanded a hearing. On this a murmur arose. He persisted, and the pagan priests cast lots, which resulted in favor of hearing Anscarius. Thenceforth the Gospel was openly preached in Sweden, but its progress was slow, in spite of the devotion of Archbishop Unni, one of St. Anscarius's successors. Olaf, who was baptized in 1001, was the first Christian king of Sweden. Thereafter churches, monasteries, and pilgrimages multiplied, especially under Sverker and St. Eric IX. Scara was the first episcopal see, and was soon followed by others, of which Upsal became the metropolitan.

**N**ORWAY.—The daring pirates known as Northmen, or Normans, were nearly all from the Norwegian coast, where they returned often laden with

sacred vessels, ornaments, and reliquaries plundered from the churches. Hence Norway had at an early date some notion of Christianity. After the conversion of their countryman, Rollo, the Norwegian kings themselves took the initiative. One of them swore in an assembly of the people that he would offer no more sacrifices, except to the God of the Christians ; another urged his subjects to be baptized along with himself. “ You so readily forsake the gods of our fathers,” they retorted, “ how can we be faithful to your new God ? ” National opposition subsided under Olaf I. (994) and totally ceased under St. Olaf II. (1033), who, assisted by Anglo-Saxon and German priests, consolidated the Norwegian Church by founding the primatial basilica of Drontheim and the cathedrals of Bergen, Hammer, and Stavanger.

In the year 1000 Christianity was favorably received in Iceland by a popular assembly. The Icelanders then undertook to convert Greenland, which their navigators had discovered. Thus all the Scandinavians were converted.

### Sec. 3.—Conversion of the Slavs.

RELIGION AND CHARACTER OF THE SLAVS.—The mythology of the ancient Slavs was very simple. It consisted in a belief in *spirits*, with a vague notion of a Supreme Being and a hope in a future life. That was the sum of their religious belief. However, they soon materialized their *spirits*, and divided them, like the Persians, into two general classes : one class were white and good gods, the other class black and wicked. They made monstrous representations of these gods, with three or four heads. A powerful

priesthood, under a supreme pontiff at Novgorod, offered human sacrifices and succeeded in gaining an ascendancy over families. The Slavs were sociable, hospitable, cheerful, bold in war but docile to their masters. They differed essentially from the Germans in their Oriental contempt for woman, who was often burnt with the corpse of her husband. Their religious dualism and brutality to women were evidently Asiatic importations or traditions.

While the Slavs groaned under the yoke of the Goths, Huns, Avari, or other conquering pagans, they could give but little thought to Christianity. But once delivered from their oppressors, surrounded by Christians, and in communication with Central Europe, they would naturally turn, it would seem, to a religion in harmony with their character and primitive belief. But such was not the case. The southern Slavs, established by Heraclius, or Constantine Pogonatus, in the two Illyrias, conformed only outwardly to the Christian faith, and awaited freedom from the imperial yoke to abandon it. The Slavs scattered along the frontier of the Carlovingian empire allowed themselves to be instructed and baptized to please Charlemagne, but on the decline of the empire of the Franks the masses returned to their gods. But the hour was come for their apostles to bring them into the fold of the Church.

**SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS, APOSTLES OF THE SLAVS.**—The city of Thessalonica, in Macedonia, was much frequented by foreigners of every nation, on account of its commerce and its seaport. Here in the ninth century were born of distinguished parents the brothers Methodius and Constantine. Methodius, the younger, seems to have early embraced the

military profession and to have risen to the rank of general, while his brother, afterwards called Cyril, availing himself of the influx of strangers at Thessalonica, applied himself to the study of languages. So great was his progress that he received the surname of *philosopher*. He was ordained priest, while soon afterwards his brother entered a monastery. A deputation of Kazares having come to Constantinople (850) to solicit a Christian preacher, the patriarch Ignatius designated Constantine, who remained long at Kherson and converted many Kazares, without, however, being able entirely to free those weak-minded people from their superstition.

CONVERSION OF THE BULGARIANS.—Meanwhile Methodius, by request of King Bogoris, left his cell and came amongst the Bulgarians of the lower Danube. His eloquence, and the impression produced by a picture of the last judgment, brought about the conversion of the king, who in baptism took the name of Michael. The nation imitating their king, Constantine came to his brother's aid. It was then that Constantine invented the Slavonian alphabet and a current hand suitable to that tongue, to which he arranged a liturgy. He translated most of the Bible into this language, which was a means of gaining to Christianity not only the southern Bulgarians who had adopted a Slavonian idiom, but also all the nations of Slavonic race. The converted Bulgarians enjoyed intimate relations with the great Pope Nicholas I., who wrote for their instruction a famous epistle. King Michael Bogoris, to sanctify himself, entered a monastery, but continued to watch over his people. Still the Bulgarians were too near Constantinople, especially after their union with the

empire (1019), to escape its influence. With the Greeks they were drawn into the schism, in which they have generally remained to the present day.

CONVERSION OF MORAVIA AND BOHEMIA.—At the close of the ninth century the Moravians were the haughtiest and most influential of all the Slavs. Disliking as well the German priests as the king, Louis the German, they solicited missionaries from Constantinople. Cyril and his brother Methodius, with the sanction of Pope Nicholas I. (863), came to them and zealously labored for six years. The delighted Moravians were converted for ever to the faith. Cyril, spent with toil, withdrew into a monastery, where he died soon afterwards (868). Methodius was consecrated at Rome as archbishop of Pannonia. He continued to govern his church twenty years longer, notwithstanding the complaints constantly made against him to the Holy See by the German priests, who found fault with his use of the Slavonian liturgy, although that liturgy had been approved by the pope. He completed the translation of the Scriptures into the Slavonian tongue, which at his brother's death had got no further than the Psalter and the Gospels. While giving his special attention to the central Slavs, he confirmed the southern Slavs in the faith. He exerted more direct influence over the Czechs of Bohemia, whose duke, Borziwoi, he baptized (890), and who, with his consort, St. Ludmilla, labored most actively in the conversion of his subjects. After this prince's death a reaction took place, in which Ludmilla and her grandson, St. Wenceslaus, fell victims to the pagan fury. Under Boleslaus the Pious (967–999) the triumph of Christianity was made permanent.

**CONVERSION OF THE POLES.**—St. Methodius is so venerated by the Slavs that each Slavic people claims him as its apostle, particularly the Poles, who assert that he preached the Gospel among them soon after the accession of Piast, their first king. The precious seeds of Christianity were certainly brought to Poland by exiled Moravians who had known Methodius; but the Polish nation began to be Christian only under Duke Micislaus, the husband of the pious Dombrowka of Bohemia, who prevailed on her husband to receive baptism (966). The Poles were attached to their idols, but they loved their prince still more. For his sake and by his order they seized the statues of their gods and, with great grief, broke them and cast them into the Vistula. They then listened to the preachers of the Gospel, among whom was St. Adalbert of Prague. The admirable life of this apostolic man moved the hearts of the Poles, and their resistance ceased when they heard of the heroic death which he met at the hands of the barbarous Prussians, and of the numerous miracles wrought at his tomb. They came in crowds to venerate the relics of the missionary martyr and to crave baptism. Boleslaus the Brave (992–1025) was no less zealous than his parents, and before his death saw Poland Catholic.

**CONVERSION OF THE RUSSIANS AND HUNGARIANS.**—The Slavs of the Elbe were not so speedily converted, notwithstanding the six bishopries founded in their country by Otho the Great, and the salutary example of their prince, Gottschalk. The latter had been killed in a riot excited by fanatics, after which the pagan priests seized Bishop John of Mecklenburg and conducted him in pomp to their temple,

where they immolated him to their deity. The Russians would not have been so docile if the faith had not been preached to them and baptismal water poured upon them by the imperious order of their grand duke, Vladimir. They did not resist.

The Hungarians had been reclaimed from their ravaging career and severely chastised by Henry the Fowler and his son. As soon as they saw their khan, Geysa, led to the baptismal font by his wife, Saralta (996), they asked that they might all be baptized. But, nevertheless, they continued to sacrifice to their gods, even after their baptism, when Vaïc, who in becoming Christian was named Stephen, succeeded to his father. Brave, just, magnanimous, full of faith, the holy king (997–1038) constituted himself the apostle of his dear Hungarians. By his marriage with the sister of St. Henry he entered into close alliance with Catholic Germany, whose civilization he introduced into his kingdom. He founded the archbishopric of Gran (Strigonium), ten bishoprics, and four abbeys in Hungary, and hospices for his subjects at Ravenna, Rome, Constantinople, and Jerusalem. The golden crown sent him by Pope Sylvester II., with the title of king (1000) and the right of having the cross borne before him, are symbols of the wholesome influence he exerted during forty-one years. The premature death of his son, St. Emeric, occasioned some difficulty in the succession, but the storm, passing by, ushered in the happy reigns of Geysa the Great, and of his brother, St. Ladislaus (1077).

CONSOLATIONS AND HOPES OF THE CHURCH.—Meanwhile feudalism had brought profound humiliations upon the ecclesiastical hierarchy. But the sanc-

tifying action of the Catholic Church does not depend on the personal sanctity of her ministers. Since the age of the apostles no epoch, perhaps, had seen so many nations converted to Christianity. The three Scandinavian kingdoms, the four great Slavonian countries, and the two principal Scythian nations in Europe not only embraced the faith but bore fruits of consummate holiness. Not a throne, not an independent sceptre, but was honored by a saint, and often by a martyr. In those countries where formerly thousands of idols were enshrined, where human victims were immolated, where murders, pillage, and invasions were rife, churches and monasteries arose, piety was propagated, and civilization developed.

In the north of Europe there were still pagans who could be converted only by armed knights ; in the south, Mohammedans who were never converted, and who were to be driven by war into the burning deserts. Such was to be the task of the Church, and of the Christian republic that was to follow.

## FOURTH EPOCH (1073-1270).

**FROM THE ACCESSION OF ST. GREGORY VII.  
TILL THE DEATH OF ST. LOUIS—197 YEARS.**

The Papacy and Christian Europe—thus we denominate this epoch, because we see Europe, united in the same faith, forming a vast republic of confederate states under the direction of the Holy See. The sovereign pontiffs, having freed the Church from the encroachments of imperial power and feudalism, encourage great military expeditions in the cause of religion, both in Europe and the Orient. All Christian nations take part in the Crusades—French and English, notwithstanding their rivalry, and even the Scandinavians, scarcely converted and civilized. A new invasion, that of the Mongolians, leaves no lasting traces, except in Russia. Everywhere Catholic civilization, inspired with the religious sentiment, produces admirable masterpieces and illustrates the most glorious epoch of the mediæval ages.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### **STRUGGLE OF THE POPES WITH THE EMPIRE (1073-1250).**

The Church, enslaved by the feudal system, and, as it were, secularized, struggles energetically for liberty. After the first conflict she obtains a recognition by princes of her independence, wholesome for herself and honorable for the sovereign. After the second, the popes, wishing to strengthen their temporal authority at Rome, espouse the interests of the Italian people, and end by humbling the empire.

**Sec. 1. Investitures; St. Gregory VII. and Henry IV.; Concordat of Worms (1073-1122).**

**SITUATION OF THE CHURCH BEFORE THE STRUGGLE.—**The eloquent and austere Peter Damian thus

complains of the perversity of the eleventh century, and his words are corroborated by the testimony of contemporaries : “ Priests are no longer regarded with the respect which is their due ; the holy canons are trodden under foot ; laymen usurp the rights of the Church, invade its possessions, and enrich themselves with the substance of the poor as though it were the spoils of the enemy ; princes openly put up for sale the priesthood of souls, the government of monasteries, the keys of heaven ; they find among the sons of Simon the Magician buyers who fleece the flock to pay their sacrilegious debts. Alas ! even the Apostolic See, once the glory of the world, has fallen a prey to simony.”

It is unfortunately true that at this epoch the Western clergy had nearly everywhere fallen under the pernicious influence of secular life, and had lost all right to popular respect. A great number paid no heed to the obligation of celibacy, if they knew of its existence. Most of the prelates owed their dignity either to intrigues, servility to princes, or to the scandalous traffic stigmatized as simony, because the purchaser, like Simon Magus, seeks to buy the gift of God with money.

**INVESTITURES.**—These disorders all arose from a principal cause which at first glance was not of sufficient importance to lead to notable effects. But all the great minds of the eleventh century saw its fatal drift. Sovereigns had grown into the habit of investing archbishops, bishops, and abbots with the most expressive insignia of their spiritual dignity, just as they had been accustomed to do in the investiture of a purely temporal dignity. By solemnly conferring the crosier and the pastoral ring on the pre-

lates elect, the king or emperor evidently seemed to confer jurisdiction over souls ; hence spiritual power emanated from the will of the prince and underwent all the resulting conditions, being accessible not to the most worthy but to the richest, the most favored, and, in fact, to the highest bidder. From this source flowed all manner of evils—simony among courtly prelates ; license among other ecclesiastics, who were ill-instructed and ill-governed ; utter disregard of discipline among the monks, and want of respect among the simple laity.

Moreover, the Papacy, though sovereign in its temporal patrimony, was tossed about between the claims of Italian princes on the one hand and the exactions of the German emperors on the other. Henry III., in return for his services, had just re-assumed the exclusive privilege of confirming or vetoing any pontifical election ; he made a rigorous use of this privilege, which resembled investiture, and subjected the supreme authority in religion to the will of a secular prince. The Catholic hierarchy was everywhere subjected to the feudal laws ; the pope himself, accepted or named by the emperor, was merely a vassal.

It was, then, of paramount necessity to free the Church from these chains ; and, above all, to shake off the yoke that weighed down the pope, and thereby give the clergy the liberty, purity, and consideration they had lost, and without which their sacred ministry is barren.

REFORMING POPES ; HILDEBRAND CARDINAL (1049-1073).—After the Council of Sutri (1046), which healed the schism of Rome, Gregory VI., again become John Gratian by his abdication, fol-

lowed the emperor beyond the mountains, taking with him his pupil Hildebrand, the son of a Tuscan carpenter. Both master and disciple stopped at Cluny, where Hildebrand received the religious habit from the hands of St. Odilon ; his talents, acquirements, and above all his virtues, soon caused him to be elected prior under the holy Abbot Hugh, who presented him at the emperor's court, and for some time left him in charge of the education of his young godson, the future Henry IV. The prior and abbot had just returned to their monastery when Bruno, bishop of Toul, arrived, who had been designated by his cousin, the Emperor Henry III., to succeed Pope Damasus II. Hildebrand counselled the pious prelate to lay aside the pontifical robes, then to proceed to Rome barefoot, in a pilgrim's garb, and thus offer himself to the suffrages of the electors. Bruno, having followed this counsel, was elected by acclamation, and took the name of Leo IX. This success encouraged the holy pope to undertake important reforms. Hildebrand, summoned to Rome, was created cardinal (1049). He was the man God had chosen to direct the conflicting opinions of men by his wonderful tact, and who by his indomitable firmness was to secure the emancipation of the Church. Long had his soul, consumed with burning zeal, poured itself out before God in prayer. "The lowliest woman," said he to his friends, "may accept or refuse a spouse, while the most noble of queens, the holy Church, is not left to her choice. She must be free, her children spotless and blameless, her pope independent. The Church shall be free."

Hildebrand in his solitude had already matured a

plan of deliverance. It was in accordance with this plan that, when prior of Cluny, as we have seen above, he had advised one elected by the emperor to regard that choice as null, and to have himself canonically re-elected. Raised to be cardinal, counsellor of the popes, vested with full power, and venerated by the faithful, he used his immense influence to advance the work of reform among the clergy by numerous councils, reparative legations, paternal exhortations, or exemplary chastisements ; but he still more strenuously pursued the execution of his plan after the death of St. Leo IX. and his three successors. The regular election was first effected at Rome ; then, by his credit at court and his eloquence, Hildebrand would succeed in making the emperor's choice fall upon the pope elect. Finally, under Nicholas II. (1059) regulations for pontifical elections were drawn up conformable to the views of the holy cardinal, reserving solely the honor due to King Henry as a last formality. This king was the young Henry IV., still under the tutelage of his virtuous mother, Agnes of Poitou. Thus circumstances favored the emancipation which time and prudence alone could complete.

Meanwhile other reforms were set on foot. The people often constituted themselves the too eager executors of pontifical sentences by maltreating married priests and pillaging the houses of simoniacal prelates ; sometimes Heaven confirmed by wonders the testimony of the multitude. The Florentines, in presence of the legate, Peter Damian, accused their bishop of simony. As the legate delayed to pass sentence, the people offered to prove the truth of their accusation by the judgment of God,

known as the Ordeal of Fire. Two piles were raised close together in the public square. A holy monk of Vallumbrosa was chosen for the test. The piles were kindled, and the monk after a prayer passed unharmed through the flames, his bare feet not even scorched by the burning embers they trod. The Florentines rent the air with acclamations, and the result of the ordeal was looked upon as the work of Providence and a positive confirmation of the bishop's unworthiness. He was solemnly deposed. The monk was made a cardinal, and was ever afterwards known as Peter Igneus. Still, the work of reformation met many obstacles in the vile passions of clerics, the ambition of prelates, in the privilege of confirming or vetoing papal elections which the emperor continued to arrogate to himself. The grandes of the empire had forcibly removed Henry IV. from the tutelage of his mother ; he grew up in debauchery, and shamelessly sold ecclesiastical benefices. The pontificate of Alexander II. (1061-1073), already troubled by an anti-pope, suffered from the disturbances in Germany ; on his death it was to be feared that the disorders of the king of Germany would eventually compromise the holy works so happily begun.

HILDEBRAND POPE (APRIL, 1073).—A great concourse of cardinals, bishops, clerics of all orders, and a countless throng of the laity were assembled in the basilica of St. Peter to celebrate the obsequies of Pope Alexander. Suddenly an extraordinary commotion is visible in the assembly. All cry out : “St Peter chooses the Archdeacon Hildebrand as his successor !” Hildebrand is thunderstruck and tries to ward off the impending blow ; but the peo-

ple redouble their cries, till a cardinal from the pulpit proclaims his election in these terms : “ As we deem no one better fitted to govern the Church and to defend this city than the Archdeacon Hildebrand, a man of wisdom and experience, we all, bishops and cardinals, unanimously with you choose him sovereign shepherd of our souls. He shall be called *Gregory*.” He was instantly vested in the purple robe, cope, and tiara, and seated on the chair of St. Peter. All present were full of joy ; Gregory alone was a prey to sincere and deep sorrow. Better than others he saw the extent of his obligations, the necessity of reform, the tenacity of abuses and of opposition, the utter impossibility of saving the Church without waging a frightful war. Contrary to all expectation, and despite the wishes of the pontiff, Henry approved of all that had been done ; this was the last pontifical election confirmed by the emperors.

PRUDENCE AND FIRMNESS OF ST. GREGORY VII.— Obliged to submit, Gregory seized the helm with a firm and skilful hand. He had seen that the decrees of his predecessors were often not enforced through lack of firmness : an age of iron, he said, needs a man of iron. However, he did not lose sight of the Gospel precepts of meekness and prudence. He was resolved not to let his zeal hurry him along blindly. Inveterate abuses could not at once be eradicated ; support and auxiliaries were needed. Thinking it advisable to begin by reforming the ministers of the holy altar, he was anxious to secure the assistance, or at least the respectful neutrality, of the secular princes. In his letters to sovereigns, even to the emperor of the East, to the great vassals of France,

Germany, and Italy, and distinguished personages, to notify them of his accession, he exhorts them to lend him all their authority to put down license and simony amongst the clergy.

A journey which he made through Italy secured the steadfast co-operation of the powerful Countess Matilda of Canossa, and brought back the princes of Beneventum, Capua, and Salerno to their fidelity. Robert Guiscard himself hastened to do homage and to offer his own mighty sword, and to bind himself and his doughty companions to the service of the pope whenever they might be called upon. But the most directly efficacious means employed by Gregory against the vices of the clergy was the annual convocation of a council at Rome. In it were discussed all questions of law and of fact; disciplinary canons renewed; cases of ecclesiastics of every rank cited to appear were judged; the guilty were pitilessly deposed, the weak strengthened, the good encouraged. From every province the pontiff received acts of submission to his decrees. Princes, particularly Henry IV., applauded his efforts. Gregory congratulated the king of Germany on his filial submission to the Apostolic See.

CRIMES AND DIFFICULTIES OF HENRY IV.—This prince had been eager to confirm the election of Gregory, and to promote the execution of the decrees relative to the clergy throughout Germany and Italy. He thus wrote to the pope: “The clergy and the empire should be intimately united; but, alas! through the irregularities of youth, the abuse of supreme power, and evil counsellors, I have sinned against Heaven and against you. Not only have I left churches defenceless, but I have sold them to

unworthy subjects. As I cannot reform them without your authority, I implore your aid and counsel in this matter and in all that concerns me. You shall be obeyed in all things." But these generous advances offered no guarantee of sincerity. Henry was in extreme embarrassment in consequence of a formidable war against the provinces of Saxony and Thuringia, that had revolted in consequence of his lust, his exactions, and his insupportable tyranny; except a few courtiers and several simoniacal prelates who were attached to his fortunes, the great vassals of the empire contemplated deposing him. Petitions from all quarters poured in upon the Holy Father to use his supreme authority against this second Nero by excommunicating him and releasing his vassals from their oath of allegiance.

INTERDICTION OF INVESTITURES.—Gregory did not heed these clamors, but he thought the moment favorable to complete the great work of reform by correcting the abuse whence flowed all the others. In a new council held at Rome in the spring of 1075 he absolutely prohibited all lay princes to confer, and all ecclesiastics to receive, any investiture whatsoever, under penalty of the most terrible anathemas. In all the Catholic countries of Europe this decree was published, and nowhere met with any opposition. King Henry, now emperor elect, feared for his crowns in Germany and Italy. The pope, profiting by this salutary fear, tried to correct the young Henry, whom he loved, and in order to call his attention to this decree without sending it directly to him, threatened excommunication upon five imperial officers by whose counsel the churches were sold, if, before the month of June, they did not come to Rome to crave pardon.

The decisive blow was struck. Should the emperor accept the decree concerning investiture, the election of popes, prelates, and other sacred ministers would be freed from corruption and the Church emancipated. But fear, that alone had restrained Henry, vanished after the dearly-bought victory of Hohenburg (July 13), which enabled him to stifle the pitiable complaints of the Saxons. Swelling with pride, he required the pope to depose the prelates who had taken sides with the vanquished. Gregory nobly refused. Then Henry, in defiance of the pontifical decree, gave the solemn investiture of the crosier and ring to three German prelates. At his instigation some simoniacal prelates of Italy, led on by the scandalous Guibert of Ravenna, rose against the pope. Guibert went so far as to plot against Gregory's life in concert with Cencius, a wealthy and factious Roman noble. The latter seized the pontiff while he was celebrating midnight Mass in the church of St. Mary Major; had the people not risen against the criminal Cencius, the pope would have perished. This vengeance did not suffice Henry IV. A cabal met at Worms, at which an excommunicated cardinal presided; they heaped maledictions and insults upon Gregory, and pronounced against him a sentence of deposition. The prince notified the pope in a letter bearing this inscription: "Henry, king by the grace of God, to Hildebrand, the bad monk and false pope." The cleric sent to Rome to bear the message arrived as Gregory was opening his council (March, 1076), and audaciously addressed the august assembly. This effrontery would have cost him dear if Gregory had not shielded him with his own person. The pope then pronounced, in full

council, against Henry and his abettors the sentence of excommunication, which was to be followed by deposition if, before the expiration of one year, every one of the excommunicated did not seek absolution from the sovereign pontiff in person.

GREGORY AND HENRY AT CANOSSA.—This solemn sentence, which was published simultaneously throughout all Germany, and made more solemn by several heavenly manifestations, completely changed the aspect of affairs. The great vassals withdrew from Henry; Saxony again took up arms, supported this time by Suabia, Bavaria, and Carinthia; Goslar, the favorite resort of the prince, several of his castles, and two palaces were taken and pillaged; his troops were defeated; a diet held at Tribur (October 15) notified him that if before the expiration of the year he was not released from his censures, he should no longer be regarded as king, and that another should be chosen in his place. The lords informed the pope of their resolutions, entreating him to proceed to Augsburg before the end of the winter to direct and preside at the new diet. Gregory besought them by letters not to be precipitate; then, hoping to moderate them and to spare Henry, whom he wished to save, he set out for Germany, but the unusual rigor of the winter forced him to tarry at Canossa, a stronghold belonging to the Countess Matilda.

Meanwhile Henry IV., abandoned, threatened, disgraced, resolved to forestall the fatal term. Notwithstanding the intense cold, he set out from the Rhine to Canossa, accompanied by his wife, his young son, and several servants, and crossed the Jura, the icy Leman, and the Alps. The pope, to

inspire him with horror for his crimes, before admitting him to an audience required him to perform a severe penance of three days within the enclosure of the castle, and to accept certain conditions under oath. Henry unreservedly submitted, and the pope withdrew the ban of excommunication (January 26, 1077).

STRUGGLE IN GERMANY AND ITALY ; DEATH OF ST. GREGORY VII.—Henry had not yet left Canossa when, beset by some ambitious Italians and simoniacal prelates, he forgot his oath, freely mingled with the excommunicated, among others Guibert of Ravenna, and tried to seize the pope, or at least to close Germany against him. On this intelligence the German lords assembled at Forchheim, thinking themselves justified in breaking once for all with a perjured prince, without awaiting the sanction of the sovereign pontiff, chose for king the brave and pious Rudolph of Suabia. This election brought Henry back to Germany, where a bloody struggle ensued, which was not ended even by the death of Rudolph, victorious in the battle of Elster (1080). His successor was Hermann of Luxemburg, a good warrior, but who, possessing neither the brilliant qualities nor the immense influence of Rudolph, could not force Henry to return from Italy, whither he had hastened to crush the pope. In his fury Henry, not content with naming the anti-pope, Guibert of Ravenna (Clement III.), in the cabal of Brixen, sought to possess himself of Gregory's person, in order to outrage and torture him at will, and sacrifice him to his vengeance. The undaunted pontiff foresaw the storm without ceasing to watch over the Church, and even to hold his annual coun-

cil ; he put his confidence in God, and God did not forsake him. The heroic Countess Matilda roused the enthusiasm of her subjects in favor of the Holy Father ; fortifying her castles, she levied and led her troops in person across upper Italy to check the advance of the Germans. Robert Guiscard, master of lower Italy, had just cast himself at the feet of the pope to implore pardon and to swear fealty and homage to him. Rome was guarded by the troops of Matilda and the Roman princes. Henry, accompanied by the anti-pope, laid siege to that city in the spring of 1081 ; but the courage of the besieged, animated by Gregory, withstood during three years all assaults, owing to the skilful diversions of Matilda, who harassed the imperialists in the Roman Campagna and in the neighboring provinces.

Henry obtained by bribery what he could not have gained by arms. The people, weary of a prolonged siege, opened the city to the Germans ; Guibert was enthroned at St. Peter's, and with his sacrilegious hand gave the imperial crown to Henry IV. on Easter Sunday, in the presence of a mercenary populace. The rejoicings of this triumph did not last long. Robert Guiscard was reported to be marching on Rome with a formidable army. In fact, Gregory, who had retired to the Castle of San Angelo, had informed his new vassal of his straits and called him to his aid. Henry, unable to resist, hastened to leave Rome with his anti-pope, thus abandoning the Romans, who had compromised themselves for him, to the cruel though not unmerited chastisements of Robert. This conqueror “appeared in Rome like a fierce lion, a glorious triumpher, crushing traitors under his feet or reducing them to slavery.” He

brought back the pope to St. John Lateran, where a last council was held to excommunicate the anti-pope, with all his adherents, and to affirm the superiority of the spiritual over the temporal. At the same time Cardinal Otho of Ostia, who later became Urban II., sent by Gregory beyond the mountains, published the same decrees and censures in the council of Quedlinburg, in presence of King Hermann.

Gregory's mission was fulfilled, and he could die in peace. But as the Romans attributed to him the evils they had just undergone, he went into exile. He accompanied Robert to Monte Cassino to venerate the relics of St. Benedict, and to encourage his friend, the Abbot Desiderius, as if he had a presentiment that Desiderius was to be his successor; thence he proceeded to Salerno, where he gave himself up to pious contemplation. At last, summoning the cardinals, bishops, and clerics, after some conversation with them he said: "In the name of Almighty God, in virtue of the authority of the holy apostles Peter and Paul, I command you to acknowledge as lawful pope no one who is not elected and consecrated according to the canonical laws of the Church." And then, rallying once more before he expired, he uttered the words which epitomize the history of his life: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile." And then he rested after a life of labor (May 25, 1085), leaving to his successors, with the example of his virtues, laws for reforming the clergy, and a struggle which could not fail to secure the Church her absolute independence by the triumph of the spirit over the flesh, and of mind over matter.

THE HEIRS OF ST. GREGORY VII.—Apparently vanquished, exiled, despoiled, Gregory really died victorious; his grand idea survived him; his influence in the choice of popes was as potent after as before his pontificate; the persons whom he had designated were successively elected and continued to carry out his plan, notwithstanding their fears of so formidable a succession. Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, hesitated for more than a year before he gave way to pressing entreaties and let himself be made pope under the name of Victor III. Otho of Chatillon, bishop of Ostia, who was a Frenchman by birth, resisted the prayers of the electors for six months. At last he relented and took the immortal name of Urban II. He beheld Rome in the power of the anti-pope Clement; Italy and Germany in flames; kings wavering in their obedience. But he was nothing daunted. In the two glorious councils of Piacenza and Clermont, in the presence of immense multitudes, he declared his adhesion to the principles of St. Gregory VII., condemned the investitures, excommunicated the guilty monarchs, Philip and Henry, and preached the first Crusade. Then he entered Rome, whence the anti-pope had been driven. The death of Urban II. (1099) was no gain to the anti-pope's three successors; the lawful pontiff, Pascal II., whom Gregory VII. had invited from Cluny, was soon acknowledged by all the faithful, for he was the pope of the Crusaders, the successor of Urban II., and the herald of the conquest of Jerusalem. The anti-popes had not these honors or sacred titles; moreover, they began to feel that the arm of flesh which had constituted their strength was failing.

MISFORTUNES OF HENRY IV. ; HIS DEATH (1106). —For some time the emperor congratulated himself on his good fortune : his most terrible adversary, Gregory, had fled, and Rome for twelve years remained closed against the lawful popes ; Robert Guiscard was dead ; the Countess Matilda, in consequence of her attachment to the Holy See, was abandoned by her husband, Welf or Guelph of Bavaria, whose family had been reconciled with the emperor ; the anti-Cæsar Hermann, having retired to his domains, died soon afterwards. But now began a series of misfortunes which arose in the bosom of Henry's own family and ended in a frightful catastrophe. His eldest son, Conrad, had himself proclaimed king, and during six months occupied the fairest provinces of the empire ; his wife denounced him before the council of Piacenza, revealing his turpitude and demanding vengeance ; his noblest kinsmen deserted him for the Crusades ; finally, Henry, his youngest son, and sole heir since Conrad's death, also revolted and held his father in prison until invested by him with the insignia of royalty, after which he compelled him to leave the country. Arrived at Liege, the old emperor wrote to King Philip of France a sorrowful account of his woes. What is still more lamentable is that he renounced all reconciliation with the Church, and died without any sign of repentance. His body was deprived of the honors of sepulture. A truly sad end for a prince seemingly born with happy inclinations, but whom, after a fifty years' reign, evil counsellors, pride of power, and licentiousness plunged into an abyss of woe.

DISGRACEFUL PROCEEDINGS OF HENRY V. (1106-

1125).—It might be supposed that the affair of the investitures was terminated by the accession of a king who had taken arms to force his father to a reconciliation with the Church. But Henry V., after the shameful brutalities which earned for him the surname of Parricide, lost no time in displaying his ambition, perjury, and hypocrisy in broad daylight. Pascal II., like his predecessors, desired the independence of the Church and the abolition of the investitures; but while he had many virtues, he was wanting in firmness, and proved himself more conciliatory than his predecessors by withdrawing all censures from Philip I. of France, and Henry I. of England. With Henry V., hitherto zealous for the Church, Pascal thought he might be more unyielding. He required that prince absolutely to renounce the investitures. The latter indignantly alleged the right inherent to his crown, and to enforce it encamped with thirty thousand knights on the plains of the Po, preparatory to marching on Rome. The pope advanced against him as far as Sutri; by an excess of generosity he expressed himself ready to restore to the king all the ecclesiastical fiefs of Germany and Italy, and to crown him emperor, provided he would for ever renounce the investitures. Henry did not expect so generous a proposal, which he knew would be ill received by the higher clergy as little in harmony with the needs of the times; nevertheless he accepted. This agreement met so loud an expression of dissatisfaction from the clergy that the pope was compelled to retract the decree. This the king had foreseen, and, immediately seizing the person of the pope, regardless of the strenuous resistance of the Romans, he cast him into prison, deprived him

of food, and inflicted such ill treatment upon him that the pontiff was forced to sign a new compromise, in substance as follows : “Elections of prelates shall be made freely, without simony, in presence of the king, who shall decide in case of a doubtful election ; the king shall confer the investiture with the crosier and ring after which the prelate elect shall be consecrated.” This arrangement departed from the plan of St. Gregory, but it was also far from meeting the insane demands which had been made by Henry IV. Wearied of war, the pope signed it ; and then, having promised not to excommunicate the king for imprisoning him, he was restored to liberty, and Henry V. was crowned emperor (1111). This mingling of violence and perfidy in an emperor towards a captive pope was almost identically reproduced seven centuries later.

Henry V.’s odious proceedings were blamed even by his most steadfast friends, among whom Conrad of Salzburg and the young Norbert, the future founder of the order of Premonstratensians. The pope was too conscientious to excommunicate the prince, but the bishops of France and Germany did not hesitate to do so in the councils of Vienne and Cologne. The concessions of the pope excited debates, in the course of which what had been a vexed and complicated question was made so clear that it was possible to distinguish what belonged to God from what might be allowed to Cæsar.

**CONCORDAT OF WORMS (1122) ; NINTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (1123).**—In the discussion caused by the decree of 1111 some theologians heartily approved of what the pope had done, and others, injudiciously lauding St. Gregory VII., taxed the decree

with heresy, while several found means to reconcile the liberty of the Church with the right of the emperor, who was temporal sovereign of property and persons. Pascal II. made Henry propositions most honorable to the crown ; but Henry would hear nothing. He again set out in haste to Italy, under pretext of regulating the succession of the Countess Matilda, recently deceased, but in reality to seize this rich possession, which of right should have fallen to the Holy See. At Henry's approach Pascal fled from Rome ; but he was brought back by the Normans and died soon afterwards (1118). His successor, Gelasius II., was also compelled to flee. He died at Cluny after a pontificate of a few months. A French prince, Guy of Burgundy, archbishop of Vienne, who took the name of Calixtus II., was then elected. With him terminated the struggle. In a council at Rheims he made moderate propositions to the emperor. Henry, who had just created an anti-pope, rejected the propositions of Calixtus ; but being threatened with excommunication, and seeing Germany in commotion, he dreaded his father's fate and hastened to the diet of Worms (1122). There Henry V. renounced the investiture by the ring and crosier, granted full liberty of elections, and promised to restore to the Church all its possessions. The pope, on his part, agreed that the elections of Germany should take place in presence of the emperor or his representative, and left it to him to decide in case of doubt. Besides this, the prelates elect of Germany, Italy, and Burgundy might receive investiture by the sceptre, and thus acquit themselves of their obligations towards their sovereign. Such was the Concordat of Worms,

which realized the grand idea of St. Gregory VII. and justly caused universal joy. The following year the pope convoked an oecumenical council in the Lateran basilica ; nearly a thousand fathers approved the Concordat, decreed in detail the restoration of discipline, and occupied themselves with the fate of the Christians in the East and in Spain. This was the Ninth Ecumenical Council, and the first held in the West (1123).

Everything relating to the liberty of the Church was regulated. Two years later Henry V. died without posterity ; an election gave him as successor Lothaire II. (1125–1137), a very pious prince. Fearing that his presence would unduly influence the elections of bishops, he made no use of the right which the Concordat gave him, and was content with an oath of allegiance taken by the prelates after their consecration. The Church was then free, not only in law but in fact.

**Sec. 2. The Popes and the Hohenstaufens; Guelphs and Ghibelines; Independence of Italy; the Long Interregnum of the Empire (1137–1272).**

**LIBERTY IN ITALY; ANTI-POPES AND DEMOGOGUES; ARNOLD OF BRESCIA (1130–1155).**—The liberty guaranteed to the ecclesiastical electors by the articles of the Concordat, and the conscientious reserve of the Emperor Lothaire, although in themselves most praiseworthy, led at first to some grievous results. It often happened that an election was contested and that two prelates disputed for the same see. Now, while in Germany the emperor's known desire could settle the dispute in favor of one of the parties, the case was otherwise in Bur-

gundy and Italy. In the latter country especially, the inhabitants of the cities could no longer brook the temporal dominion which the bishops had exercised from time immemorial, and still less the power which the lords who had their castles in the city or neighborhood arrogated to themselves. As for the imperial count, he had lost all authority. From this epoch dates the creation of the consuls, appointed by the people to govern the city, and the invention of the *carroccio*, a car surmounted by an altar, cross, and standards, around which the people rallied when they had resolved on war. Already the Italian cities were republics ; the bishops generally had renounced their political privileges, which moreover had been greatly curtailed and almost annulled by the contested elections.

The Romans could not help feeling the breath of liberty that swept over Italy. Contested elections, the lawful pope held in check or driven away by an anti-pope, the intervention of a foreign prince, the harangues of demagogues—all these causes came near compromising the temporal power of the sovereign pontiffs. At the death of Calixtus II. (1124) there had been a double election, but, as one of the elect renounced his claim, schism was obviated. At the death of Honorius II. (1130), however, there was a schism which lasted eight years ; the anti-pope Anacletus (Peter de Leone), having conferred upon Roger of Sicily the title of king, and so won his powerful support, Innocent II. was forced to quit Rome and betake himself to France, where his cause was pleaded and won by the eloquence of St. Bernard. Brought back in triumph by his illustrious champion, it was nevertheless not till after the death of

Anacletus that Innocent was able to maintain himself at Rome. Then he convoked the Tenth Æcumenical Council (1139). This was the second Lateran Council, and it met to complete the reform of the Church, to condemn the schism of Anacletus, and to anathematize certain heretics, among whom was Arnold of Brescia.

Arnold had been the disciple of the famous Abelard in France. On his return to Italy he took the monastic habit. But from the principles of his master, and the ideas of reform which then occupied all minds, he had formed a doctrine of his own. According to his views, clerics, prelates, nay, even the pope himself, should possess no revenue, no temporal power, in order to attend solely to spiritual works. This political heresy, preached, nevertheless, with fiery eloquence by a monk of an austere life, soon gained ground among the Roman people during the schism of Anacletus. The dream of the Romans was to revive their ancient sway over the entire world. But the return of Pope Innocent, the solemnity of the council, and the conclusion of peace with Roger, whom the pope acknowledged as king, forced Arnold to escape, first to France, then to Zurich. But his party in Rome was powerful enough to create a senate, a patrician, and tribunes; he himself soon returned and harassed the successors of Innocent II., particularly Eugene III., who was brought back to Rome by his glorious vassal, King Roger, the conqueror of the Greeks and of Northern Africa. On the other hand, the republicans of Rome appealed to Conrad III. to hasten there to rule the world, exacting "what was Cæsar's by obliging even the pope to pay tribute, as St. Peter had done by

order of Jesus Christ." Conrad either could not or would not heed this appeal.

**CONRAD III. (1137-1152); THE GUELPHS AND GHIBELINES OF GERMANY.**—The reign of Lothaire II. had been disturbed only by the claims of the family of Hohenstaufen, represented by Frederick the Cross-eyed, duke of Suabia, and his brother Conrad, duke of Franconia. The latter had assumed the title of king, which he relinquished at the entreaties of St. Bernard. For this he was generously indemnified by the Emperor Lothaire. Elected to succeed the latter, Conrad of Hohenstaufen did not imitate his generosity. The family of the Guelphs (Welfs), represented by Henry the Proud, the son-in-law and heir of Lothaire, held Bavaria, Saxony, and Tuscany. On the pretext that this family was too powerful, Conrad declared it to have forfeited Saxony and Bavaria, and he bestowed these fiefs upon other vassals. But Henry the Proud speedily reconquered Saxony, which had remained loyal to him; death prevented him from recovering Bavaria, where his brother, Guelph of Altorf, was at the head of an army with headquarters at Winsberg Castle. Conrad and his troops approached, crying, "Waiblingen! Waiblingen!" the name of the seat of the Hohenstaufens, near Würtemberg, and the first fief they possessed. The Winsberg soldiers responded with cries of "Welf! Welf!" the name of the family for whom they were fighting. Such is the origin of the words Guelph and Ghibeline, which so often recur in the history of the thirteenth and the two following centuries, and which, transferred to Italy, assumed a new meaning.

Winsberg Castle opposed a spirited resistance,

but, deprived of succor, was forced to surrender. Conrad ordered that only the women might depart and carry away whatever they held most precious ; they carried off their husbands. To put an end to the war the emperor gave Saxony to the young Henry the Lion, a son of Henry the Proud, but did not give him back Bavaria. Guelph remained without an appanage.

This intestine struggle and the political enmities it enkindled throughout the empire ; the departure of Conrad III. for the second Crusade, and his inglorious return ; finally, the difficulties of the undertaking, precluded German interference in Italy. Conrad even declined being crowned emperor. King Roger of Sicily, master of Southern Italy and the sea, troubled himself but little about the rest of the peninsula, where anarchy was rife. Venice, Genoa, and Pisa began to venture upon the sea ; Milan domineered over the free cities of the plains and destroyed Lodi ; Pavia took the lead of the Ghibeline cities which still inclined to the king of Germany.

FREDERICK BARBAROSSA (1152-1190).—Conrad III., on dying, had designated as his successor not his son, then too young, but his nephew, Frederick of Hohenstaufen, duke of Suabia, surnamed Barbarossa, at that time thirty years of age. Learned, handsome, brave, and generous, Frederick was profoundly impressed with the grandeur and majesty of royalty. Scarcely was he elected and crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle than he settled, in capacity of suzerain, the dispute between the claimants to the throne of Denmark. He resolved to subdue Hungary, and endeavored to pacify the Guelphs by restoring Bavaria to Henry the Lion. Then, influenced by political and

religious motives, he turned his eyes towards Italy. After crossing the Alps (1154) he hung up his buckler in the plains of Roncaglia, near the Po ; thither, according to custom, all the Italian feudatories repaired to renew their homage, after passing one night as guard to the king. Envoys of the prince were sent to all the towns to collect the dues of the royal treasury. Some cities having defied these envoys, Frederick marched against them and destroyed several, among others Tortona. Before setting out for Rome he received the iron crown at Pavia, then, crossing Tuscany, encamped on the borders of the Tiber.

The pope was Adrian IV. (Nicholas Breakspear), the only Englishman who has ever sat in the chair of St. Peter. His temporal authority was almost entirely set at naught by the Roman people, now more than ever under the influence of Arnold of Brescia. Arnold, being excommunicated, escaped from Rome, and, while wandering in the Campagna, fell into the power of Frederick, who delivered him to the pope. The prefect of the city hastened the trial, and by the orders of Frederick and with the assent of the people, the demagogue was first strangled in the Castle of St. Angelo, and then his body was burnt in presence of the people. After this execution the Romans thought to impose conditions upon the future emperor ; they demanded, before his coronation, money, certain privileges, and the guarantee of their liberty by an oath. They dilated on the ancient greatness of their city, but Frederick replied : "I marvel at your words, which are more arrogant than wise. Doubtless Rome was once great and powerful ; but a Frank has come, great in name and in

exploits, who has taken away her liberty. All is now in my power—your consuls, your senate, your soldiers.” The prince afterwards held the stirrup of the pope, who, proceeding to St. Peter’s Church, solemnly crowned Frederick as emperor of the Romans (June 18, 1155). The indignant populace threw themselves upon the imperialists, who easily mastered them, killed many, and drove hundreds into the Tiber. The emperor, quitting Rome, dealt severely with the disobedient people of Spoleto and with the revengeful Veronese. Returning to Germany, he compelled all to bend to his will ; the king of Poland was humbled, the duke of Bohemia awarded the title of king. Frederick was at the zenith of his power in the sixth year of his reign ; his height was so great that he might naturally expect to become dizzy.

A new expedition was set on foot against Italy to chastise the spirited city of Milan and the heir of the brave Roger of Sicily, William I. This latter had repelled the attack of the Greeks, who were Frederick’s allies, and besides had done liege homage to the pope for all his possessions, and this homage irritated the emperor. A letter from the pope increased his irritation. Adrian reproached him with some excesses for which he demanded satisfaction, and paternally reminded him that he had cheerfully granted him signal benefits (*beneficia*). This Latin word grated on the ears of Frederick, who understood *beneficia* in the feudal sense, and supposed that he was regarded as a feudatory. Cardinal Roland further embittered him by exclaiming : “ From whom, then, does the most noble emperor hold his crown ?” The pope thought it better to mollify the

prince by himself offering a loyal explanation of the word. Nevertheless Frederick passed over to Italy (1158), laid siege to Milan, which was compelled by famine, pestilence, and the sword to surrender. The emperor had his throne erected two leagues from the city; the archbishop, the consuls, and the notables of the city approached barefoot and bare-headed. After them came the people with ropes around their necks; all prostrated and took the oath of allegiance. Thence Frederick again proceeded to the plain of Roncaglia to hold a solemn diet. Four doctors of law from Bologna proclaimed aloud that "the will of Cæsar is law, and the good pleasure of the prince has the force of law." According to this autocratic principle the bishops, nobles, and cities of Italy were judged; a famous constitution was drawn up in the name of Frederick, emperor, ever Augustus, to determine taxes, the census, to regulate the government of cities, the transmission of fiefs, and the oaths of vassals. The emperor, without consent of the pope, assessed taxes on church property, invested Guelph with Tuscany, which had been left to the Holy See by the Countess Matilda, and arbitrarily disposed of several archbishoprics. Excommunication was about to be launched against Frederick when Adrian died (September 1, 1159).

ALEXANDER III. (1159-1181) AND THE LOMBARD LEAGUE.—The tyrannical exactions of the emperor met with violent opposition in Lombardy, especially in Milan, Cremona, and Brescia. Frederick had sworn to avenge the outrage offered to his pretended rights. Before passing the plough and sowing salt over the ruins of Milan, he halted under the walls

of Cremona, casting over to the besieged the heads of their prisoners, while the besieged retaliated by tossing back the heads of the imperialists. He there learned that Cardinal Roland, elected by the majority of votes pope under the name of Alexander III., had a competitor in Octavian (Victor IV.), elected by a minority favorable to the emperor. The emperor, without abandoning his other undertakings, gladly gave the investiture to his creature, Octavian, and did his utmost to annul the election of Alexander. Octavian had been acknowledged by the conciliabule of Pavia. Like Innocent II., the pope was driven to seek refuge in France. With this schism ended Frederick's successes.

After the destruction of Milan (1162) he returned to Germany, where troubles had arisen; but more serious difficulties soon recalled him into Italy, which had revolted against his tyrannical commissaries. Meanwhile the anti-pope died, and Alexander re-entered Rome. To smother the agonizing cry of the suffering cities, and to uphold the new anti-pope, Frederick hastened across the Alps to raise an army and to march upon Rome, which he easily took, without capturing Alexander, who had fled to Benevento. While pestilence was decimating his troops trouble arose in his rear: fifteen Lombard cities bound themselves by treaty to defend their liberties, to rebuild Milan, and to uphold Alexander, who was in alliance with them. Frederick, out of his head, flew to Pavia, and thence to Susa, with an escort of but thirty men; he came near being taken prisoner, and escaped only through a disguise (1168). The Lombard League steadily increased, and built a city called Alessandria in honor of the pope.

Frederick was preparing to take signal vengeance. While awaiting his coming Christian of Mayence laid siege to Ancona, heroically defended by the citizens, and delivered by the army of the League. The emperor, arriving, burnt Susa, marched upon Alessandria, nicknamed by the imperialists Straw, but met with so determined a resistance that Frederick was forced to raise the siege. Henry the Lion, offended by a refusal of the emperor, returned to Germany with all his vassals. For a moment Frederick thought of suing for peace; but his resentment gained the upper hand, and he advanced to the attack of the castle of Legnano, five leagues from Milan. He was in turn attacked by the confederate army, and, in spite of his bravery, beheld his banner and treasures falling into the hands of the enemy, his troops cast into the river or driven to shameful flight (May 29, 1176). At the same time the imperial galleys were seized by the Venetians.

TREATY OF VENICE (1177); ELEVENTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (1179) AND PEACE OF CONSTANCE (1183).—Frederick was reduced to sue for peace, and Venice was assigned as the meeting-place. Pope Alexander was the first to keep the appointment, and magnanimously received the emperor at the entrance of the Church of St. Mark. On beholding the august pontiff against whom he had been so long in arms, Frederick, unable to master his emotion, cast aside his imperial mantle and threw himself at the feet of the pope. The latter immediately raised him, gave him the kiss of peace, and granted him the enjoyment of Tuscany for fifteen years. The emperor, in return, concluded a peace of fifteen years with King William the Good, of Sicily, and with the

Lombard cities—a truce which six years later was exchanged for a permanent peace. In commemoration of this joyful reconciliation, the pope presented a ring to the doge of Venice as a symbol of the union of the Venetians with the sea. The repentant and degraded anti-pope received an abbey (July 25, 1177).

The Romans, not less jubilant than the other Italians, and thoroughly disabused of their political utopias, besought the pope to return at once to Rome. Alexander re-entered it triumphant. He soon convoked in the Lateran basilica (March, 1179) the Eleventh Ecumenical Council, which prevented for a long while the danger of doubtful elections by requiring two-thirds of the votes to constitute a valid election. The Papacy now held peaceful sway over liberated Italy.

The emperor was not so fortunate in Germany. To punish Henry the Lion for deserting him in Italy, he declared him a felon and deprived him of his two great fiefs (Saxony and Bavaria), leaving him only his freeholds in Brunswick. The vast inheritance of the house of Guelph was parcelled out into twenty petty principalities, comprising New Saxony and New Bavaria, all holding immediately from the crown. The lay and ecclesiastical possessors of these immediate fiefs became so many sovereigns, having their courts, army, taxes, and currency. This, as will be seen later, imperilled the superior authority of the suzerain. At the diet of Constance (June 25, 1183) Frederick was forced to acknowledge definitely the independence of the Lombard cities, which, however, were obliged to pay the emperor some honors and to take the oath of alle-

giance. Thenceforth the Italian republics chose their senate, councils, and their civil magistrates ; a *podestà*, ordinarily a foreigner, was in some cities made supreme judge and had the power of declaring war. A few cities still adhering to the emperor constituted the Ghibeline party in Italy ; while the greater number, clinging to their national independence, were called the Guelph party, less through attachment to the family of that name than from opposition to the imperial power. The history of these two parties was for two centuries the history of Italy.

Frederick Barbarossa was, in a domestic point of view, fully indemnified, even in Italy, for his losses in Lombardy. His eldest son, Henry, married Constance, daughter of Roger II., legitimate heiress of all the Norman possessions in Southern Italy. The old emperor again raised his head and made gorgeous pageants. The popes feared, not without reason, that they should be hampered more than ever both north and south by the Hohenstaufens ; they were beginning to remonstrate and threaten when their attention was directed to Jerusalem, just taken by Saladin. Frederick, till then more attentive to the temporal interests of his children than to the just displeasure of the Roman pontiffs, nevertheless proved that he was alive to the calamities of Christendom ; he valiantly assumed the cross at the age of sixty-eight. His heroism and tragic death (June, 1190) cover a multitude of faults.

POPE INNOCENT III. AND THE CLAIMANTS TO THE EMPIRE (1198-1216).—Frederick Barbarossa had left his son, Henry VI., to succeed him in Germany (1190-1197). That prince, in violation of all jus-

tice, disgraced himself by imprisoning Richard Cœur-de-Lion (the Lion-hearted), and, with the ransom money so shamefully extorted for the release of Richard, he fitted out an expedition in order to obtain possession of Sicily. His cruelties there won him the surname of Cyclops, and his ambition rendered him formidable to the Church. He died suddenly, leaving Sicily to his only son, three years old, and already named king of the Romans. This child, who became Frederick II., was confided to the tutelage of the Church and of the pope. His education was so well cared for, and his hereditary kingdom so perfectly administered, that the royal orphan had a double reason to call the Church his good mother and the pope his tender father. This pope was the great Innocent III., the faithful imitator of the Gregories and Alexanders, the arbiter of kings and nations, the promoter of the holy wars and at the same time the organizer of peaceful institutions, the indefatigable champion of the rights of the Church as well as the rigid guardian of internal discipline.

It was of paramount importance to the sovereign pontiffs that the crowns of Sicily and of Germany should not be worn by the same head. The separation had been exacted and promised at the coronation of Henry VI. On the death of the latter the infancy of his son induced the German electors to enter, perhaps in spite of themselves, into the views of the Holy See by choosing a prince from amongst themselves. The votes were divided between the Guelph Otho of Brunswick, a son of Henry the Lion, and the Ghibeline Philip of Hohenstaufen, duke of Suabia and brother of Henry VI. Naturally, Inno-

cent III. favored Otho; but Philip, by his conciliatory promises, was about to overcome the objections of the pope when he was assassinated (1208). All the votes of the electors then fell to Otho, who lavished gifts, promises, and oaths, and was crowned emperor by the pope (1209). Otho IV. was no sooner crowned than he made haste to break every one of his promises, to violate all his oaths, to stir up the Romans against the pope, and to dethrone Frederick of Sicily. The pope threatened him; but, the emperor paying no heed to threats, the pope excommunicated against him the terrible excommunication (1211). Otho returned to Germany, but too late; the principal lords no longer acknowledged him. The youthful Frederick had left Palermo, and, escaping the ambushes laid for him in Lombardy, he appeared at Constance (1212). Vainly Otho strove to check the people and the nobles; all flocked to Frederick, attracted by his name, his kindly manners, and his largesses. The fallen emperor found no support save in his uncle, the feeble King John of England, in whose cause he allowed himself to be beaten at Bouvines (1214). Then, retiring to private life, he died four years afterwards, reconciled to the Church.

Meanwhile Frederick was solemnly crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, after having in the diet of Egra confirmed by a golden bull all the prerogatives of holy mother Church, according to the Concordat of Worms and the other constitutions of the sovereign pontiffs. He proposed to resign Italy to his newborn son; he even put on the cross to please his good father, Pope Innocent, who in the Twelfth Ecumenical or Fourth Lateran Council proclaimed the

rights of Frederick to the empire (1215). But Pope Innocent III. died the year after.

FREDERICK II. (1212-1250) AND HONORIUS III. (1216-1227); SUBTLE HYPOCRISY.—In the successor of Innocent III. Frederick found but a devoted friend in place of a clear-sighted father. He was anxious to profit by the change to ruin his enemies in Germany and to secure the election of his son, while he was at the same time preparing the way for his supremacy in Northern Italy without letting go of the South; and this in direct violation of his sacred engagements, his vow to go to the Crusade, and the kindness of the pope.

Damietta, held by the Crusaders, was besieged by the Mussulmans (1219): Honorius besought Frederick to set out; the latter, representing that the house of Guelph detained the crown jewels, craved delay and the help of the papal censures, to which Honorius assented. Damietta was taken. The pope again reminded him of his oath; but Frederick still delayed. The time at an end, he demanded an extension till autumn, so as to take revenge on the miscreants who calumniously charged him with intending to have his son elected king of the Romans. In autumn, soliciting another extension till the next spring, under pretext of gathering together the laggard crusading lords, he humbly begs to retain a life interest in the two Sicilies. Honorius, who till now had granted everything, formally refused. Frederick then assured him that he would be satisfied with a contingent interest in case his son, the heir of Sicily, should die before himself. The pope, having granted this request, was overwhelmed with blessings by his most loving son, full of gratitude.

Spring come, an ambassador arrived from Germany bearing a flattering letter to the pope, and another intended to excite the Romans against the pope. Thus Frederick prepares for his coronation. But why comes he not himself? was asked at Rome. It was soon noised about that in a diet held at Frankfort young Henry, the son of Frederick, had just been elected king of the Romans; his father had so gained over the electors that the vote was carried without opposition. However, Frederick protested in his letter to the pope that the election was made in spite of himself during his absence; moreover, that Honorius was free to reverse a choice made only in the interests of the Church. Honorius, perhaps, believed in the sincerity of Frederick, not supposing him capable of such refined hypocrisy.

After settling everything according to his desires in Germany, Frederick set out (1220) for Rome with a brilliant retinue; there, having promised to trample out heresy, uphold the Holy See, to separate Sicily politically from Germany, and to go to the Crusade, he was crowned (1220). It was soon evident how he would keep the first two promises when he so openly evaded the last two. Though emperor of Germany, he continued to rule Sicily arbitrarily. A Crusader, he obtained a respite of two years every two years till the death of Honorius. During one of these respites he undertook to overcome the Saracens, who still infested the mountains of Sicily; but, far from crushing them, he spared them, and, regardless of excommunication, conveyed twenty thousand to the mainland as future auxiliaries. Another respite permitted him to convoke a diet at Cremona, where he sent an army corps, under pre-

text of restoring peace among the Lombard cities rent by the Guelf and Ghibeline factions. These cities at once saw the danger. Milan brought out her carroccio ; fifteen cities pledged themselves anew to the Lombard confederation ; young Henry of Germany could not effect the junction of his troops with his father's, and the latter was forced to retreat in shame. Meanwhile Honorius III. died (1227).

FREDERICK UNMASKED BY GREGORY IX. (1227-1241).—Gregory IX., an octogenarian and a kinsman of Innocent III., had just been raised to St. Peter's chair. He too had loved Frederick, but under the preceding pontificate he had learned to know him. The history of the sixth Crusade proves the firmness of the pope and the cold impiety of this prince, who was at last compelled to raise the mask. When the emperor had re-entered Italy the pope absolved him from the censures he had incurred, and, through the talents of the Dominican John of Vicenza, had arranged a treaty of peace between him and a large number of cities. Gregory showed his sincerity by blaming King Henry for rebelling against his father, the emperor, and by warning the German nobles not to take part in the revolt. Frederick at this very time was treacherously making war against the Church by compiling, with the aid of Pietro delle Vigne, a Collection of the Laws of Sicily, in which absolute Cæsarism supersedes the Christianity which then formed the basis of all legislation, as it regulated all religious and civil institutions. The pope contented himself with opposing this code by the publication of five books of *Decretals*, arranged by the Dominican doctor St. Raymond of Peñafort.

After substituting Conrad IV. in Germany for Henry, the emperor returned to Italy, destroyed Vicenza and Mantua, beat the Milanese, trampled under foot the Italian franchises by the aid of the Calabrian Saracens and the Lombard Ghibelines, among whom Eccelino da Romano figured conspicuously. The pope then, along with the Genoese and Venetians, threatened Frederick, and when the latter made Enzio, one of his natural sons, king of Sardinia in defiance of the Holy See, Gregory fulminated a sentence of excommunication, released the subjects of Frederick from their allegiance, and reproached Frederick himself with having spoken the execrable blasphemy that the world had been the dupe of three impostors, Moses, Jesus Christ, and Mohammed. Frederick denied that he had uttered this blasphemy, and called Gregory the dragon of the Apocalypse. Nor was this all : with his Saracens he laid waste the Roman Campagna, and, relying on the Ghibelines in the city, encamped under the walls of Rome. But the undaunted Gregory preached a crusade against Frederick, and convoked a council. Frederick was compelled to retreat before the Crusaders ; while the bishops hastening to the council were made prisoners. This news aggravated a malady from which the venerable pontiff was suffering, and he died, aged ninety-eight (1241).

FREDERICK PUT DOWN BY INNOCENT IV. (1243-1254).—The excommunicated emperor seemed to triumph the more surely because he held a great number of bishops and cardinals in his power at Naples. His permission was needed to elect a new pope, Celestine IV., who died eighteen days after his election, and had no successor for seventeen months.

At last Frederick's intimate friend, Sinibaldo de' Fieschi, a noble Genoese, was elected, and took the name of Innocent IV. "Fieschi was my friend," said Frederick on learning the election, "but Innocent will be my enemy." Frederick took pains to make his prophecy come true. The new pope was disposed to remove the excommunication, provided the emperor would consent to appear before a council. Frederick's only reply was to march upon Rome, destroying everything on his way. He tried to seize the pope, but Innocent was carried by the Genoese fleet to his own country, and from there he went to Lyons, where he assembled the thirteenth general council (1245). Before the assembled fathers Innocent deplored the success of the Monguls, the destruction of the Eastern Christians, the schism of the Greeks, the heresies of the West, and the outrages of Frederick. The emperor had sent Pietro delle Vigne and Thaddeus of Suessa to plead his cause before the council. The latter alone urged a delay, which was granted, but it was only to appeal to another council and to another pope. Then Innocent arose, saying : "I am the vicar of Jesus Christ. I have the power of binding and loosing. I therefore declare Frederick guilty of sacrilege and heresy, excommunicated and degraded." Then the fathers, as a sign of adhesion to this, threw their lighted tapers upon the ground. "Day of wrath, of woe, of calamity!" exclaimed Thaddeus on leaving the council. "I have done my duty," said the pope, and he intoned the *Te Deum*.

On hearing of his deposition Frederick put on his crown, exclaiming: "Torrents of blood shall flow ere it falls from my head." With his Saracens

he took vengeance on the Guelphs in Romagna and Tuscany, put out the eyes of his prisoners, and spared not even Pietro delle Vigne. Eccelino and Enzio stood by him in Lombardy, and Conrad in Germany. But Conrad was held in check; the Germans proclaimed Henry Raspon landgrave of Thuringia, who died shortly afterwards and was succeeded by William, count of Holland. Enzio was taken by the Bolognese, who passed a law never to surrender him; the Neapolitans, too, were in commotion. Notwithstanding his success in Tuscany, Frederick, beaten at Parma, was compelled to sue for peace; he offered satisfaction, and promised to fight in the Holy Land till the end of his life. And in the midst of his trouble sickness seized him, and he was forced to retire to a small city of Southern Italy, where he died overwhelmed with grief and humiliation (1250). Frederick was a man of valor, generosity, wit, and learning, but he was also given to licentiousness, pride, duplicity, cruelty, and, above all, he seemed incapable of respect for religion, which was the glory of his illustrious contemporaries, St. Louis and St. Ferdinand.

**EXTINCTION OF THE HOHENSTAUFENS; THE LONG INTERREGNUM OF THE EMPIRE (1250-1272).**—Frederick II. was dead; Conrad IV., his sole legitimate son, quitted Germany, where with difficulty he stood his ground against William of Holland, and claimed his hereditary kingdom of Sicily, which was contested by Manfred, a natural son of Frederick II. Conrad easily won obedience from his Sicilian subjects, but he died at the age of twenty-six, leaving his young son, Conratin. Manfred seized upon the government, had himself made king without regard to his

nephew's rights and in violation of the pope's suzerainty ; he crushed the Guelphs in Florence, and then defied Alexander IV. at Rome. In the north of Italy Eccelino the Ferocious was still at the head of the Ghibelines, and succeeded in surprising the Guelph cities, many of whose unfortunate inhabitants he had beheaded and quartered in the public squares, while their possessions were confiscated to the use of Ghibelines. A crusade was preached against him and met temporary success. He captured Padua from the Marquis d'Este, and confined eleven thousand of the Paduans in the dungeons of Verona, where they starved to death. At last Eccelino was wounded and taken prisoner. He refused all care, and, having torn open his wounds with his own hands, his death was as violent as his life had been.

At last the Lombard cities breathed again, but the Two Sicilies were bowed down under an insupportable yoke. In order to shake it off Pope Urban IV. summoned a brother of St. Louis, Charles of Anjou, count of Provence. This hard, dry, and haughty man set out from Marseilles, and, entering the Tiber in spite of Manfred, was crowned and invested by the pope at Rome, and marched to the conquest of his new kingdom. Under the walls of Benevento he met his adversary, who threw himself headlong into the midst of the enemy ; his body was not found until three days after the battle (1266). Conradin, representative of the Hohenstaufens, still remained. He lived in a castle in Bavaria, where he had been brilliantly brought up by his mother amid poets and military men. The harshness of Charles of Anjou turned the thoughts of all on the young prince, then but fifteen years old, who set out, notwithstanding

ing the apprehensions of his mother. Enthusiastically received at Pisa, he proceeded by Sienna to Viterbo to intimidate Pope Clement IV. "Fear nothing," said the pontiff to his people; "they are victims going to the sacrifice." Arrived at the plains of Tagliacozzo, the rash troops of Conradin were attacked on the flank by the small army of Charles. Conradin and his young friend, Frederick of Austria, were seized. Several days later the hapless prince mounted a scaffold erected in the square of Naples in sight of the magnificent bay. "O mother!" he exclaimed, "what sorrow have I brought upon you." He threw his glove into the crowd and laid his head upon the block. With him ended the house of Hohenstaufen (October 29, 1268).

With the death of Frederick II. began in Germany what is termed "the long interregnum of the empire" (1250-1272). For twenty-two years there was, properly speaking, no acknowledged emperor. Conrad IV. was opposed by William of Holland, and after the death of these two competitors the election of Richard, earl of Cornwall, was offset by that of Alfonso of Castile, who did not even appear in Germany. The great vassals exercised all royal rights in their domains; seven especially reserved to themselves exclusively the right of electing the emperor. Petty vassals claimed the privilege of depending on none, save paying homage to the nominal suzerainty of the crown. Imitating the Lombards, many cities became independent, appointed their own magistrates, made their own laws; they made leagues among themselves, as in the case of the Hanseatic cities and the free cities of the Rhine, for mutual protection and in view of commercial interests.

The empire had struggled to enslave the Church. The empire was vanquished ; its yoke no longer weighed on Italy, nor even on Germany ; but the Church was still independent.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE CRUSADES IN THE EAST.

In one hundred and seventy-five years (1095–1270) eight expeditions, at once religious and military, are undertaken under the direction of the popes against the Mussulmans, in order to conquer the holy places and to liberate the Christians in the East.

**Sec. 1. First Crusade (1095–1099); Power of Islam and Weakness of the Eastern Empire; Godfrey of Bouillon, King of Jerusalem (1099); the Knights Hospitalers and the Templars.**

**CAUSES OF THE FIRST CRUSADE.**—As there is no event in history so important as the coming of Jesus Christ, so there never was a land so holy as that where the Saviour of men accomplished the great mystery of the redemption. Every place which he had consecrated by his presence became an object of veneration to the first Christians, especially Mount Calvary, the scene of his sorrowful Passion and glorious Resurrection. That sacred mount, profaned by the enemies of Christianity, was, under the first Christian emperor, restored to the piety of the faithful. St. Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, was fortunate enough to discover the cross and the sepulchre of our Saviour (326). The magnificent Church of the Holy Sepulchre, raised on the very spot, drew thither multitudes of pilgrims, till

in 638 Jerusalem fell into the power of the Mussulmans. The holy patriarch Sophronius died of grief, and all Europe was in consternation. A senseless caliph, Hakem (996–1021), having become master of the Holy City, persecuted the worshippers of the true God because he claimed divine honors for himself. Pope Sylvester II. then gave the first signal of the Crusades. The Christians of the West, whose faith was enkindled with new ardor, set out in greater numbers than ever to Palestine,\* and their indignation at the evils there endured inspired them with the thought of taking up arms in order to cast off the yoke of their persecutors. “After escaping a thousand perils of death,” said William, archbishop of Tyre, “the pilgrims, on reaching the gates of Jerusalem, were not permitted to enter unless each one paid a piece of gold as tribute to the infidels. Having lost everything on the way, the greater number had not wherewith to pay toll. Thus they were

\* Among the pilgrims who visited the Holy Land in the course of the eleventh century history cites Fulk, count of Anjou, and Robert, duke of Normandy. Fulk, called Nera, or Black, being guilty of several crimes and tortured in conscience, set out for Palestine in the humble garb of a pilgrim. Arrived at Jersusalem, he went through the streets of the Holy City with a rope around his neck, beaten with rods by his valets, repeating aloud: “Have mercy, O Lord! on a faithless Christian, a perjuror and assassin.” The conversion of Fulk was sincere; he became as dear to his people by his meekness and charity as he had been odious by his excesses. Several years later Robert the Magnificent, or the Devil, quitted his duchy of Normandy with staff and wallet, barefoot, and clothed in sackcloth. A servant who did not recognize him having struck him with a stick, he merely said: “A pilgrim must suffer everything for his sins;” adding, “I prize sufferings endured for Jesus Christ more than the richest city of my duchy.” His piety and munificence made him famous all over the East. As he was traversing Asia Minor, compelled on account of his maladies to be borne in a litter by four Saracens, a Norman pilgrim, meeting him, asked him what word he would send back to his country. The duke replied: “Go tell my people that you have seen a Christian prince borne to Paradise by four devils.” Robert died at Nicæa, expressing his regret that he was not permitted to breathe his last sigh in the Holy City of Jerusalem.

obliged to bivouac outside the city, where they soon fell victims to want and famine. Such as paid tribute and entered Jerusalem endured stripes, and even death, from the Mussulmans. During divine office the infidels entered the churches, uttering furious cries ; they even seated themselves on the altars, overturned the chalices, trampled under foot the sacred vessels, heaped insults upon the clergy, not even respecting the patriarch, whom they plucked by the beard."

A pious pilgrim who, in concert with the patriarch, sought to rescue the holy places, originated the great movement called the Crusades, and his project was favored by the religious fervor of the West, the union of all Christian states under the direction of the sovereign pontiffs, the chivalrous spirit of princes and nobles, and the fear produced by the alarming progress of the infidels, who threatened to destroy the Eastern Empire and thus open their way into Europe.

THE SELJUKIAN TURKS.—In the latter half of the eleventh century the Mussulmans, then masters of the African coast, still threatened Christian Europe on the Mediterranean, in Spain, and in the south of Italy. But they were especially formidable in the East. Tartar hordes from Turkistan had crushed the Gaznevides and chosen as chief Togrul-Beg, a grandson of Seljuk. Togrul-Beg, in response to the appeal of the Abbasside caliphs, entered Bagdad at the head of 200,000 Turks, and destroyed the rule of the Buides. The caliph, in recompense, transferred to him the temporal sovereignty of all the Mussulman states. He put Togrul-Beg beside him on the throne, and put two turbans upon the Turk's

head, and hung two swords at his sides, as a sign that he was to be sovereign of the East and the West (1058). Thenceforth the Abbasside caliphs exercised only spiritual authority as the successors of Mohammed.

The Seljukian sultans, invested with full political and military power, distinguished themselves from the first by their brilliant victories and conquests. Alp-Arslan (Strong Lion), a nephew and successor of Togrul-Beg, dispossessed the Greeks of Armenia and Georgia. The Eastern emperor, Romanus IV., having essayed to check him, was beaten, taken prisoner, and forced to bite the dust before the conqueror, who styled himself the master of Asia (1071). The emperor was set at liberty in consideration of a great ransom and the promise of an annual tribute. Under Malek-Shah (1072–1092), the eldest son of Alp-Arslan, the empire of the Seljukians reached the highest point of its greatness. While the sultan extended its boundaries to China and to the Indus, his lieutenants advanced to the Bosphorus and the Mediterranean; they wrested from the Greeks all Asia Minor except Trebizond, and from the Fatimites Cairo, Syria, and Palestine. At the death of Malek-Shah his vast empire was dismembered to form the sultanates, or independent states, of Damascus, Aleppo, Persia, and Iconium. The sultan of Iconium, whose capital was Nicæa, possessed all Asia Minor and encamped within sight of Constantinople. The other sultans were less powerful, so that the Fatimites of Cairo retook Jerusalem (1094), and held sway there till the coming of the Crusaders.

THE SECT OF ASSASSINS AND THE OLD MAN OF THE MOUNTAIN.—In the midst of the Seljukian

empire arose a sect even then famous, and which was to be as much feared by Mussulmans as by Eastern Christians. Its founder, Hassan, had been chamberlain to Sultan Malek-Shah. Having fallen into disgrace with his master, he had sought shelter in Egypt, where he adopted the monstrous maxim of the Ismaïlian Fatimites : “Nothing is true and everything is lawful.” Hassan, having enrolled his proselytes in a sort of secret society, possessed himself of the fortress of Alamout, or Vulture’s Nest, in the mountains of Persia (1090). Called thenceforth the Sheikh-al-jabal, or the Old Man of the Mountain, his rule extended afar, and the terror of his name still further. His orders were known to a few of the initiated alone, and were executed by the faithful—better known as Assassins, from Hassan, or perhaps from an intoxicating potion called *hashish*, whose property was to rouse them to frenzy. These abominable fanatics, dreaming they had tasted all the delights of Mohammed’s paradise, were equally disposed to inflict or to suffer death. Their first act was to glut the vengeance of their chief : the grand vizier of Malek-Shah was assassinated. In reply to the threats of the sultan Hassan gave the ambassador a proof of his power. He gave orders to one of his faithful to stab himself—he did so ; to another to cast himself headlong from the window over a precipice—at once the command was executed. “Know, then,” added the Old Man of the Mountain, “that there are seventy thousand who at the least sign are equally ready to do my bidding.” Malek-Shah, having at his disposal a numerous army, thought himself able to punish these miscreants ; but soon after the mightiest of the Seljukians fell a victim to the

Old Man of the Mountain. One of his sons burned to avenge his death, and threatened to exterminate the sect of Assassins; one morning on awaking he found by his bedside a sharpened dagger. "This dagger," wrote Hassan, "lying near your head could as easily have been plunged into your heart." The sultan, frightened, consented to treat with the Old Man of the Mountain, who retained all the fortresses he had built as far as the Anti-Lebanon mountains. The successors of Hassan, inheriting his power and cruelty, destroyed thousands of victims, among whom were caliphs, sultans, and Christian princes. This odious sect was not exterminated till the latter half of the thirteenth century—in Persia by the Monguls and in Syria by the sultan of the Mamelukes.

AFFLICTION OF THE EASTERN EMPIRE UNDER THE COMNENUS DYNASTY.—Michael Cerularius had just completed the schism from the Latin Church when the family of Comnenus, one of the most ancient of the empire, ascended the throne of Constantinople (1057). This elevation was due to the caprice of the soldiery, and to a people whose sole passion was hatred to Rome. It was easy to predict that the empire could not defend itself against its new and formidable foes. The Seljukian Turks, victorious everywhere in Asia Minor, pitched their tents on the very shores of the Bosphorus. On the other hand the Normans, led by Robert Guiscard, after driving the Greeks from Southern Italy, pursued them beyond the Adriatic, dispossessed them of Durazzo, and threatened to advance upon Constantinople. Northward the Hungarians and the Tatar hordes spread their ravages along the right bank of the Danube. But the Greeks of the Lower Empire,

insensible to these signs of trouble, were busy changing masters and quarrelling among themselves. The emperor, Alexis Comnenus, who was a skilful general, was unable to infuse ardor into this degenerate people. Money, soldiers, vessels, everything was wanting to the emperor when he saw his capital threatened by the powerful fleet of the Seljukian Turks (1095). In his distress he turned to the West for assistance. This appeal helped to decide the first Crusade. But Alexis Comnenus could not enter into the generous feelings of the Crusaders and treated them as barbarians ; he tried to profit at their expense, sometimes by an alliance with them, and almost as often by furnishing aid to their Musulman enemies in return for a share in the spoils. This treacherous policy was imitated by his successors, and in the end was fatal to the empire. In the last years of his long reign (1081–1118) Alexis won the contempt of Crusaders, infidels, and his own subjects. Even the empress at his death-bed reproached him : “ You die, as you have lived, a hypocrite.”

PETER THE HERMIT AND URBAN II. ; COUNCIL OF CLERMONT (1095).—The Crusades are among the most wonderful facts in history, and yet they were brought about in the providence of God, as is usual, by an obscure person, a poor pilgrim who had no authority but his eloquence and virtue. A priest of the diocese of Amiens, called Peter the Hermit, on arriving at Jerusalem was deeply afflicted to see the holy places profaned and Christians shamefully outraged by the infidels. Fired with holy zeal, he made known to the patriarch Simeon his determination to lay the matter before the sovereign pontiff

and to appeal to the Western princes. Shortly after he entered the Church of the Resurrection to pray. "Night coming on," says a historian of the time, "Peter, worn out by his prayers and long vigils, stretched himself upon the pavement of the nave to sleep. And lo ! while he slept our Lord Jesus Christ came and stood before him, saying : ' Arise, make haste, O Peter ! Do with courage what I have commanded thee. I shall be with thee ; for the time is come to purge the holy places and to help my servants.' Peter arose, strengthened by the vision of God, and, according to the order from on high, set out in haste."

Pope Urban II., to whom he vividly depicted the sorrowful condition of the Holy Land, entered into his plans and resolved to work for its deliverance. He directed the Hermit to prepare the people by his moving eloquence. Peter, mounted on a mule, crucifix in hand, barefoot, and girt with a rope, traversed the greater part of Europe, enkindling all with the fire which burned in his own bosom. Urban II. held a preparatory council at Piacenza, after which he convoked a more solemn one at Clermont, in Auvergne. Two hundred and thirty-nine archbishops and bishops attended. Several thousand lords and countless numbers of people encamped around the city. On the seventh day Urban addressed the multitude in a discourse so pathetic that all present were overcome with emotion, and cried out with one voice : *Dieu le veut*—"God wills it ! God wills it !" The greater number pledged themselves on the spot to go to the rescue of the Holy Land. They assumed as a distinctive mark a cross of red stuff fastened to the right shoulder ;

hence the name Crusaders and Crusades. To secure the peace of Christendom during the war against the infidels, the Sovereign Pontiff solemnly renewed the Truce of God, and placed under the special protection of the Church the families and possessions of the Crusaders.

The cry of “God wills it ! God wills it !” re-echoing throughout Europe, roused unparalleled enthusiasm. Every country furnished Crusaders. “Who has ever heard,” exclaims a chronicler, “of so many tribes and tongues gathered together in one army : French, Flemish, Frisians, Gauls, Bretons, Allobroges, Lorrainers, Germans, Bavarians, Normans, Scots, English, Aquitanians, Italians, Apulians, Iberians, Danes, Greeks, Armenians ? Did a Breton or a Teuton come to talk to me, not a word could I answer. But, though of divers tongues, we were as brethren and neighbors, having but one heart in the love of the Lord.”

DEPARTURE OF THE CRUSADERS FOR CONSTANTINOPLE (1096).—One hundred thousand Crusaders of every age and rank, led by Peter the Hermit and a Burgundian knight called Walter the Penniless, were the first to set out for the Holy Land. Observing no discipline and living by plunder, they naturally found none but enemies along their way. Many were slain by the Hungarians ; others reached Asia Minor only to be exterminated by the Seljukian Turks. Peter the Hermit and three thousand of his followers were all that escaped the fury of the infidels.

The regular army, however, advanced in three bodies toward Constantinople. The Lorrainers and Germans descended the valley of the Danube under the command of an already celebrated knight, God-

frey of Bouillon, duke of Lower Lorraine. The Provençals, under Raymond of St. Giles, count of Toulouse, crossed Lombardy and Dalmatia ; with this army went the legate of the Holy See, Adhemar de Monteil, bishop of Puy. The French of Languedoc, under Robert Curthose, duke of Normandy, a son of William the Conqueror, and Hugh of Vermandois, brother to the king of France, marched to the south of Italy, where they were joined before embarking by the flower of the Norman knights, commanded by Bohemond, prince of Taranto, and his cousin Tancred. Alexis Comnenus was appalled by the approach of so great a multitude of warriors. "It seemed to us," said his daughter, the Princess Anna, "as if Europe, torn up from its foundations, was hurled entire upon Asia." In order to be prepared for the encroachments of his powerful allies Alexis made a hostage of Hugh of Vermandois, who had been wrecked on the coast of Epirus. This perfidy would have brought him ruin had he not soon restored the French prince to liberty. As he particularly feared the enmity of Bohemond, son of Robert Guiscard, he won him over by presents and induced the Crusaders to swear fealty to himself. The ceremony took place in a vast plain under the walls of Constantinople ; there a throne had been raised, on which sat the emperor to receive homage. A certain lord, named Robert of Paris, ascended and sat down beside the emperor, and, as his companions-in-arms asked him to come down, he exclaimed : " My troth ! here is a nice clown seated, while so many illustrious captains are standing." The Frenchman's words were interpreted to Alexis, who asked him who he was. " I am a Frenchman," replied Robert, " of the

highest nobility. Near a church in my village is a place where the young fellows meet to try their strength, and, although I have often been there, not one ever dared to encounter me.” Alexis, terrified by so bold an indifference, hastily closed the ceremony, and was glad when he saw his dangerous friends well across the Bosphorus. He had taken good care of his own interests, for the Crusaders had bound themselves to give over to him the cities that had formerly belonged to the empire, and to place their other conquests under his suzerainty.

THE CRUSADERS IN ASIA MINOR AND SYRIA (1097–1098).—Six hundred thousand Crusaders, of whom one hundred thousand were knights, were encamped on the plains of Nicæa. The sultan of Iconium, Kilij-Arslan (Lion’s Sword), abandoned Nicæa, which opened its gates and was taken possession of by the Greeks. The sultan hoped to revenge himself at Dorylæum, in Phrygia. At the head of one hundred and fifty thousand knights he suddenly attacked a division of the Christian army; he would have cut it to pieces had not Godfrey of Bouillon arrived in time to snatch victory from him. Incessantly harassed by the Turks, and suffering from thirst, the Crusaders made a painful march across the arid plains of Asia Minor; in a single day five hundred perished of thirst. To complete the disaster the Crusaders were on the point of turning their arms against one another on account of the city of Tarsus, which Baldwin, count of Flanders, brother to Godfrey of Bouillon, sought to wrest from Tancred. Baldwin, censured by all the leaders, withdrew from the army and set out to conquer Edessa, in Mesopotamia (1097).

The army of the Crusaders entered Syria and laid siege to Antioch. This famous city, defended by thirty thousand Moslems, was surrounded by wide ditches and a parapet flanked by three hundred and sixty impregnable towers. The Christian knights failed in all their attacks. After eight months they almost despaired of taking the city, when Bohemond found means to enter it under cover of the darkness. As a reward he was made prince of Antioch (1098).

Kerboga, sultan of Mosul, appeared at the head of three hundred thousand infidels. The Crusaders, besieged in their turn, were suffering from famine and contagious diseases, and they soon gave way to utter despair. Then a priest of Marseilles, Peter Bartholomew, announced that St. Andrew had appeared to him and revealed the spot in which the lance-head that pierced our Saviour's side was buried ; they dug in the place indicated and there found the point of a lance. This gave them new hope. Full of enthusiasm, they issued from the city, fell upon the infidels, killed one hundred thousand, and put the rest to flight. This brilliant victory laid Palestine open to the Crusaders.

FOUNDATION OF THE KINGDOM OF JERUSALEM (1099).—Combats, labors, and privations of all kinds had exhausted the Christian army, so that there remained but fifty thousand Crusaders able to bear arms. When they reached the hills of Emmaus, and beheld Jerusalem afar off glowing in the rays of the rising sun, they threw themselves upon their faces in the dust and kissed the ground with respect ; then as they advanced, exhilarated with enthusiasm, they shouted the watchword : “God wills it ! God wills it !” But their success was not at first

equal to their hopes ; their advance was repulsed. The forty thousand infidels within had left nothing undone that could help the defence ; outside the walls they had filled up the wells and had changed the country into a desert. The Crusaders, in spite of heat, thirst, and hunger, cut down the trees of a distant forest and constructed moving towers higher than the ramparts of the enemy. After five weeks of toil and fighting they made a solemn procession around the city and prepared themselves, by fasting, for the final assault. Godfrey of Bouillon and Tancred, followed by the bravest knights, rushed upon the ramparts and took Jerusalem on Friday, at three in the afternoon (July 15, 1099).

As soon as victory was certain and tranquillity restored the Crusaders, laying aside their arms and their blood-stained garments, went barefoot, weeping and striking their breasts, to the sepulchre of Jesus Christ in the Church of the Resurrection. The chiefs met to elect a king able to preserve this precious conquest. The choice fell upon Godfrey of Bouillon, the most virtuous and valiant captain of the whole army. He was proclaimed king near the Holy Sepulchre. When a golden crown was offered him the pious hero refused it, saying : “God forbid that I should wear a golden crown in the place where the King of kings was crowned with thorns !”

The new kingdom of Jerusalem was divided into five great fiefs : the seigniory or kingdom of Jerusalem, the county of Edessa, the principalities of Antioch and of the Tiberiad, and the county of Tripoli. These great fiefs, which held directly from the crown, were subdivided into a great number of other fiefs, whose holders paid homage to the great feudatories.

The clergy, who held solely from the pope, obtained a fourth part of Jerusalem with numerous privileges. As most of the Crusaders spoke Romance, the new laws were drawn up in that language. They are known as the “Assizes of Jerusalem.”

The caliph of Cairo, having leagued with the Seljukians, endeavored to recover Palestine; but a final defeat near Ascalon put an end to his hopes and crowned the king of Jerusalem with glory (1100). Godfrey de Bouillon died soon after, without issue. His brother, the count of Edessa, proclaimed king of Jerusalem under the name of Baldwin I. (1100–1118), made new conquests. His cousin and successor, Baldwin II. (1118–1131), extended the kingdom from the coast of Ascalon to Mount Taurus, and it never exceeded these limits.

**THE KNIGHTS HOSPITALERS AND THE TEMPLARS.**—The Eastern Christians, constantly menaced by the infidels, were neither sufficiently numerous nor disciplined to maintain themselves in their new conquests; a permanent militia, combining in the highest degree the religious and military spirit, was indispensable. Alongside of feudal chivalry arose religious chivalry, whose members were both monks and soldiers. Of the thirty religious and military orders of the Middle Ages, the two most famous were instituted after the first Crusade. The Hospital of St. John the Baptist, founded in Jerusalem for sick pilgrims, became the cradle of the order of Hospitalers, whose first grand master was the blessed Gérard Thom of Martiques (1100). Raymond du Puy, his successor, framed a rule founded on that of St. Augustine, and it was confirmed by a bull of Pope Pascal II. (1113). To

the three ordinary vows of obedience, poverty, and chastity was added the special vow of receiving, entertaining, and protecting pilgrims. Their habit was a black robe and mantle, with a white cross of eight points on the left shoulder ; the color of their shields was red. Forced to quit Jerusalem after the battle of Tiberias (1187), the Hospitalers at first withdrew to St. John of Acre, then to the island of Cyprus (1291–1310), next to the island of Rhodes (1310–1522), and finally to the island of Malta, which was donated them by the Emperor Charles V. in 1530. Bonaparte, in his Egyptian expedition, occupied Malta (1798), and while there put an end to the political existence of this famous order, known successively as Hospitalers, Knights of St. John of Acre, Knights of Rhodes, and Knights of Malta. The order of Malta was re-established in the Pontifical States a few years after its suppression by Bonaparte, and it is still in existence.

The order of Templars was founded by Hugh de Payens (1118) in a house near the ruins of Solomon's Temple ; hence the name Knights of the Temple, or Templars. The knights wore a white habit with a red cross, symbols of purity and martyrdom. Their rule, written under the direction of St. Bernard, was approved by Pope Honorius II. (1127). Besides the three ordinary vows of religion, the Templars made a special vow to exile themselves for ever from their native land, and to wage unceasing war against the infidels ; they were always to face the enemy, even when one against three, never to ask quarter, surrender for ransom, or yield an inch of wall or an inch of ground. The grand master withdrew from Jerusalem to St. John of Acre (1187), then to the island

of Cyprus (1291), and at last to Paris. The order of Templars became very rich, having at one time more than nine thousand domains in different states of Europe. By an arrangement between Philip the Fair, king of France, and Pope Clement V. the order of Templars was suppressed at the Council of Vienne (1312).

**Sec. 2. Second Crusade (1147–1149); Louis VII. and Conrad III.; Third Crusade (1189–1193); Frederick Barbarossa, Philip Augustus, and Richard Cœur de Lion; the Teutonic Knights.**

ST. BERNARD; REVERSES OF CONRAD III. AND LOUIS VII. (1147–1149).—The kingdom of Jerusalem, weakened by intestine divisions, was in danger of again falling into the power of the infidels. Zenghi, the emir of Mosul, and his son Nureddin, founders of a new empire, had twice taken the city of Edessa and massacred over thirty thousand Christians (1144–1146). Their fanatical troops spread consternation to the very walls of Jerusalem. The Eastern Christians again called upon their brethren of the West for help. St. Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, was commissioned by Pope Eugenius III. to preach a second Crusade. No one was better calculated to induce Europe to undertake the holy war than this eminent servant of God ; his learning, his eloquence, and the austerity of his life had rendered him the oracle of Christendom. Louis VII., king of France, was the first whom he induced to assume the cross. In a war with the count of Champagne the royal troops had set fire to the church of Vitry, and the greater part of the inhabitants, who had fled

thither for refuge, perished in the flames. Louis VII., seized with remorse, thought the Crusade the surest means to expiate his crime. He held a great assembly at Vézelay, and placed St. Bernard beside him on an immense platform erected in the public square. The eloquent preacher excited the liveliest enthusiasm among his hearers, who pledged themselves to set out for the Holy Land. The same success attended the diet of Speyer, where Conrad III. and the German lords eagerly put on the cross.

Conrad, setting out first, was hampered by the poor discipline of his troops and the perfidy of the Greeks. Having reached Asia Minor, he was betrayed by his guides, who led him into defiles, where a large part of his army fell under the scimeter of the Turks. As he was retreating to Constantinople with the wreck of his army, he met the troops of France, who had descended the valley of the Danube. All the Crusaders expressed the same indignation at the Greeks, who were as cowardly as they were treacherous. "These schismatics," said the bishop of Langres, "are unable to defend Christendom and the Holy Sepulchre. A day will come when their baseness will betray Constantinople, and thus open to the infidels the portals of the West." Notwithstanding the wise foresight and energetic counsel of the prelate, it was decided not to treat the Greeks according to their deserts. The Crusaders had come, they said, to expiate their own sins, not to punish those of others. Instead, however, of imprudently marching through the interior of Asia Minor, as the Germans had done, the army followed the line of the coast as far as Ephesus. There King Louis VII., whose bravery amounted to rashness,

left the coast and ascended the valley of the Meander. Attacked suddenly in a mountain defile, he lost the flower of his army, and would himself have perished had he not displayed prodigies of valor. With great difficulty he reached the port of Adalia (Satalieh), in Anatolia, and there with the highest of the nobility embarked for Antioch. The other Crusaders, left to follow the land route, in vain strove to open a passage ; starved by the Greeks and harassed by the Turks, nearly all perished.

Louis and Conrad, joining Baldwin III., King of Jerusalem, laid siege to the important city of Damascus. Their attempt failed through differences among the commanders and the treachery of the Christians of the country, who were bribed by Saracen gold. The king of France, having lost his army, was no sooner free from the coast of Palestine on his return to France than he fell into the hands of Greek pirates ; nor did he recover his liberty until after the intervention of King Roger of Sicily. St. Bernard, held responsible for these disasters, replied, very justly too, that the Crusaders and Eastern Christians had drawn down the wrath of God by their disorders, as the Israelites had done, who had been excluded from the Promised Land.

**BATTLE OF TIBERIAS (1187) ; SALADIN'S TITHE.—**At the death of Nureddin (1173), Saladin, one of his lieutenants, inherited his power and reunited Egypt to Syria. Founder of a new dynasty, called after his father the Ayubites, this able and fanatical sultan rendered himself as dear to the Mussulmans as he was formidable to the Christians. Having learned that Reginald of Chatillon, prince of Antioch, had seized one of his caravans, he advanced to the

banks of the Jordan at the head of 100,000 infidels. The Christian army encountered him in the plain of Tiberias. The battle was hotly contested for two days; but at last numbers prevailed. The true cross, Guy de Lusignan, King of Jerusalem, and the flower of the chivalry fell into the power of the victor. Saladin, who has been too often represented as a generous and humane enemy, with his own hand murdered the prince of Antioch, ordered the massacre of all the Templars and Hospitalers, and then had the other prisoners, bound with chains, march before his throne. Far from admiring the heroism of these warriors, who, having faced death on the battle-field, now sighed for martyrdom, the cruel sultan required each of his emirs to slay a Christian knight in cold blood. Jerusalem, deprived of its bravest defenders, again passed under the Moslem yoke. Its liberation had lasted eighty-eight years. The news of this disaster threw the whole West into consternation. Pope Urban III. died of grief. His successor commissioned William, Archbishop of Tyre, to preach the third Crusade. Representations of the Holy Sepulchre polluted by the Moslems were everywhere displayed. At this spectacle the faithful, deeply affected, struck their breasts, saying : “ Woe to us ! ” Only men fit for military service were enlisted for the Crusade ; the others were to assist by the payment of what was called Saladin’s tithe to defray the cost of the holy war. The three most powerful sovereigns of Europe, Frederick Barbarossa, Emperor of Germany, Philip Augustus, King of France, and Richard Cœur de Lion, King of England, took the cross with the intention of uniting their forces in Palestine (1189).

THIRD CRUSADE ; DEATH OF FREDERICK BARBAROSSA (1190) ; SIEGE AND CAPTURE OF ACRE (1189-1191).—Frederick Barbarossa descended the Danube, and by his firmness overcame Greek perfidy. After twice defeating the Seljukian sultan of Iconium, he captured his capital, and crossed Asia Minor. The Eastern Christians hoped to find in him a match for Saladin, but the emperor, going to bathe in the icy waters of the Cydnus, was drowned not far from the spot where Alexander had narrowly escaped the same fate. His death was a terrible blow to the German army. His son, Frederick of Suabia, led the remnants of his forces into Palestine and joined Guy de Lusignan, who had recovered his liberty, and laid siege to Acre (Akka).

Philip Augustus and Richard Cœur de Lion, embarking one at Genoa and the other at Marseilles, were wind-bound off Sicily throughout the winter. A misunderstanding soon arose between the young princes, who were equally ambitious and rivals in glory and power. Richard, although affianced to the sister of the king of France, espoused Berengaria of Navarre at Cyprus (1191). Philip was stung to the quick, and being, moreover, nettled at the haughty and quarrelsome disposition of his vassal, seized the first opportunity to set sail for the Holy Land. Richard, driven by a storm on to the island of Cyprus, wrested it from the Greeks and sold it to Guy de Lusignan, who had been forced to relinquish the title of king of Jerusalem. Richard's arrival under the walls of St. Jean d'Acre enabled the Crusaders to urge on the work of the siege. In vain Saladin summoned all Mussulmans to the holy war. The garrison capitulated, and one of the first articles of the treaty was

that the infidels should restore the true cross. Richard, who had done so much for the success of the siege, was naturally irritated by the sight of Leopold of Austria's banner displayed on the summit of the tallest tower. He had it thrown into the moat. His hot temper again embroiled him with Philip Augustus, who took the first opportunity of returning to France.

Richard Cœur de Lion remained in Palestine with one hundred thousand Crusaders, and for two years distinguished himself by heroic exploits. After defeating Saladin and conquering nearly all the cities of the coast he signed a truce which secured the Christians in the possession of the coast between Tyre and Jaffa (Joppa), with liberty to visit the Holy Places free from tribute. But Richard left Jerusalem in the power of the Moslems. One day, when from a hill-top the city was pointed out to him on the horizon, he covered his eyes, saying : "O Lord God ! I am not worthy to behold the Holy City, since I cannot deliver it from the yoke of the infidels." Never, however, had a Crusader displayed more valor. He was often seen struggling, single-handed, with a host of infidels, and on returning from the combat his armor so bristled with arrows that an eye-witness compares him to a pin-cushion set with needles. The Sire de Joinville, who visited the Holy Land sixty years afterwards, testifies to the terror even then inspired by the name of Richard Cœur de Lion. "When Saracen steeds shied at a bush their masters would say : 'Ha ! dost see King Richard of England ?' And Saracen mothers quieted their children when crying by saying : 'Hold your tongue, or I'll call King Richard to kill you.'"

A tempest drove Richard upon the Dalmatian coast, and, as he endeavored to cross Austria in the disguise of a pilgrim, he was recognized and arrested. Duke Leopold, to avenge the affront of Acre, delivered him up to his enemy, the Emperor Henry VI., who kept him a prisoner. At first it was not known what had become of the king of England. According to a popular legend, Blondel, a minstrel who had long been the attendant of the king, traversed Germany to discover the place of his captivity. Stopping under every fortress, the minstrel would sing a ballad which he had composed with his master. At last he had one day the joy of hearing the voice of the royal prisoner answering to his own, and the deliverance was effected. It is certain that the emperor, at the solicitation of the pope, set Richard at liberty and reduced the price set for his ransom (1194). While the Christian hero of the third Crusade was languishing in a prison, Saladin, the hero of the Mussulmans, was giving a not less memorable lesson of the vanity of human greatness. Finding himself stricken by a fatal disease, the sultan, in the place of his standard, had his winding-sheet displayed, while the herald who bore this funereal ensign cried out to the passers-by: "Behold, Saladin, conqueror of the East, of all his conquests takes naught with him but this."

**FOUNDATION OF THE TEUTONIC ORDER (1190).**—During the third Crusade Frederick of Suabia founded under the walls of St. Jean d'Acre a new religious and military order. Known at first under the name of Teutonic Hospital of the Blessed Virgin of Jerusalem, this order, approved by Pope Celestine III., followed the rule of the Hospitalers in the practice of

the duties of charity, and in military discipline that of the Templars. The first grand master was Henry Walpot, a German noble. All the knights were to be of noble blood and of German birth. Their costume was a white mantle with a black cross on the left shoulder. In recompense for their valor before Damietta, John of Brienne authorized their grand master to assume the golden cross of Jerusalem in addition to the black cross. In 1226 the Teutonic knights took the vow to wage war against the Prussian idolaters. In 1525 Albert of Brandenburg, one of the grand masters, having apostatized, secularized the possessions of the order, which was not definitively abolished until 1809.

**Sec. 3. Fourth Crusade (1202–1204); Foundation of the Latin Empire of Constantinople (1204–1261); Fifth (1217–1221) and Sixth (1228) Crusades.**

**THE CRUSADERS AND THE REPUBLIC OF VENICE; CAPTURE OF ZARA (1202).**—The empire of Saladin, divided among his sons, seemed on the brink of immediate ruin ; but his brother, Malek-el-Adel, having become sole master of it, announced his intention of driving the Christians from the East. Pope Innocent III. commissioned a French priest, Fulk of Neuilly, to preach the Crusade. The principal lords who took the cross were Baldwin, count of Flanders ; Boniface, marquis of Montferrat ; Theobald, count of Champagne ; Simon, count of Montfort ; and Villehardouin, marshal of Champagne, one of the heroes and the historian of the fourth Crusade. The ranks of the Crusaders soon swelled to four thousand knights and twenty thousand men-at-arms. It was decided to take the sea route to attack Egypt, the

bulwark of Islam and key of Palestine. The Venetians agreed to furnish a fleet of fifty galleys, but they could not put aside their mercantile spirit, and wanted eight hundred thousand dollars for a three months' voyage. The Crusaders, unable to raise so large a sum, in lieu of it agreed to reduce Zara to Venetian dominion. This place had been given up to the king of Hungary, who also had sworn to go to the Holy Land. In vain did Innocent III. condemn the mercenary policy of the Venetians; in vain did he remind the Crusaders of their vow to wage war against none but the infidels. To banish every scruple the doge of the republic, Henry Dandolo, though blind and ninety years old, enrolled himself for the Crusade. Zara was besieged, taken by assault and pillaged, and was made the winter quarters of the army.

TAKING OF CONSTANTINOPLE (1203 AND 1204); DIVISION OF THE GREEK EMPIRE.—Alexis, son of Isaac Angelus, Emperor of the East, begged the aid of the Venetians and Crusaders to replace his hapless father, whom a usurper had driven from the throne and imprisoned. The young prince promised to reunite the Greek to the Latin Church, and to do his best for the conquest of the Holy Land. It was easy to secure the Venetians, who detested the usurper on account of his favoring their rivals, the Pisans. The Crusaders, deaf to the warnings of Innocent III., advanced upon Constantinople, which they found almost without defenders. They took the city by assault (1203). The usurper fled, and the young Alexis was proclaimed emperor jointly with his father. But that prince was driven to pledge some of his subjects for money, and this

caused so much dissatisfaction that he was deposed and strangled by one of his officers, Ducas Murzuphlus, who became emperor under the name of Alexis V. The Crusaders, disappointed of their hire, again attacked Constantinople, which they took by assault and pillaged. Murzuphlus, being captured, was hurled from the column of Theodosius (1204).

The conquerors, after destroying the Greek Empire, divided it amongst themselves. Twelve electors, authorized to name an emperor, chose Baldwin IX., Count of Flanders, whose share was a fourth of the empire ; the remaining three-fourths were halved between the Venetians and the Crusaders. The Venetians received three suburbs of Constantinople, the coasts of the Euxine (Black) Sea and of the Hellespont, the Cyclades, the Sporades, the islands and the shore of the Adriatic Sea, some cities of Thrace, and, finally, the island of Crete, which they purchased of the Marquis of Montferrat. The doge took the title of "lord of one-fourth and a half of the Roman Empire" (three-eighths), which title was borne by the successors of Henry Dandolo until 1356.

The remaining fourth and a half was divided among the principal chiefs of the Crusaders. Boniface, Marquis of Montferrat, received the kingdom of Macedonia ; the historian Villehardouin was made marshal of Roumania ; the lordship of Negropont fell to Jacques d'Avesnes, but it soon passed into the possession of Venice. A nobleman of the house of Champagne had for his share the principality of Achaia, on which depended the duchy of Athens, the county of Thebes, the marquisate of Corinth, etc.

The feudal hierarchy was fully established on the territory of the ancient republics of Greece. The new empire adopted for its constitution the “Assizes of Jerusalem.”

This empire lasted but fifty-seven years. It was first attacked by the Bulgarians, who gained a brilliant victory under the walls of Adrianople (1205); the Emperor Baldwin I. was taken prisoner, and died soon after in captivity. The Greeks, however, were the most dangerous enemies of the Latin Empire of Constantinople. With the few provinces they had saved from the wreck of their ancient empire they founded the principality of Epirus, or Albania, and the empires of Nicæa and of Trebizond. The successors of Baldwin I. were at last restricted to their capital. His nephew, Baldwin II. (1228–1261), was reduced to sell the lead of his palace, and to send precious relics to the Western princes, to obtain succor against the Greeks. St. Louis got the crown of thorns (1238), for which he built a beautiful shrine, the Sainte Chapelle, at Paris. Baldwin II., not having obtained sufficient aid, was driven from Constantinople by Michael Palæologus, Emperor of Nicæa, who founded a new Greek Empire that lasted one hundred and ninety-two years (1261–1453).

THE CHILDREN’S CRUSADE (1212); FIFTH CRUSADE (1217–1221); ANDREW II. AND JOHN OF BRIENNE.—According as the failures of the Crusades came to be attributed to the selfishness and misconduct of the Crusaders, the opinion gained ground in Europe that the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre was reserved for innocent hands. Accordingly, fifty thousand children, it is said, mostly German and French, leaving parents and country, set out for the Holy Land (1212).

Some soon died of hunger and fatigue, while others were shipwrecked or fell into the power of the Saracens through the treachery and deceit of some of the leaders of this crusade, and were sold as slaves. Innocent III., unable to help these unfortunate children, made an earnest appeal in the Lateran Council (1215) for a new Crusade. Frederick II., Emperor of Germany, promised to be its leader, but broke his word. Then Andrew II., King of Hungary, took command of the Christian army. Landing in Palestine, he at once marched against the Mussulmans entrenched on Mount Thabor. One check disheartened this irresolute monarch, and he made haste back to Europe.

John of Brienne, titular king of Jerusalem, led the crusading army into Egypt, and after a two years' siege took Damietta (1218–1219). This was a very important conquest. The sultan of Egypt, Malek-el-Kamel, a son of Malek-el-Adel, offered to surrender Jerusalem and to pay tribute. These propositions were the more advantageous as the sultan, naturally humane and generous, had just given a friendly reception to St. Francis of Assisi. King John of Brienne and the other chiefs were inclined to accept them ; but the legate Pelagius wished to march upon Cairo. The army advanced between two arms of the Nile, at the very time that the river, which furnishes the wealth and the defence of the country, was overflowing. The Crusaders' camp was soon submerged and themselves in danger of either dying of hunger or of being drowned in the rising waters. "Then John of Brienne," says a contemporary historian, "went forth, unattended, from the Christian camp to that of the infidels. He entered

it alone, his royal casque on his head, sought the sultan's tent, lifted the lappel, and, without uttering a word, sat down in a corner of the apartment, where Malek-el-Kamel himself was reclining. The sultan showed no surprise, and bowed his head to him. The slaves withdrew and both sovereigns remained seated, keeping a respectful silence. After several moments Malek perceived tears coursing down the cheeks of the king of Jerusalem. ‘Sire king,’ said he, ‘why weepest thou?’ ‘Sire king,’ replied John, ‘God has given me a people to guide and to guard, and I see that people drowning and starving; therefor do I weep.’ Then the sultan shed tears, and, clapping his hands, his slaves re-entered. He gave orders to take to the Christian camp for the next four following days thirty thousand loaves for the rich and the poor; then, turning to King John, he said: ‘The Lord is great and merciful.’”

Before the end of the four days peace was concluded; the Crusaders obtained leave to re-embark for Palestine, on condition of surrendering Damietta and maintaining peace with the sultan for eight years.

SIXTH CRUSADE; FREDERICK II. (1228).—John of Brienne, having bound himself never more to bear arms against the infidels, ceded to his son-in-law, Frederick II., the title of king of Jerusalem. Notwithstanding this additional motive for keeping his promise to conduct a crusade, the German emperor continually found new pretexts for staying at home. At last, being excommunicated by Gregory IX., he decided to embark. Scarcely landed at St. Jean d’Acre, he began to negotiate instead of fighting.

The sultan of Egypt consented to cede to him Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Nazareth, Tyre, and Sidon, on condition that the Mussulmans should have liberty of worship in those places. When Frederick had made his entrance into Jerusalem he found no bishop who would consent to crown an excommunicated prince ; he therefore put on the crown with his own hands, and then made haste back to Europe, leaving the Eastern Christians scandalized at his indifference to the welfare of the Church in the East.

#### Sec. 4. The Two Crusades of St. Louis; *Results of the Crusades; Chivalry.*

SEVENTH CRUSADE (1248-1254); ST. LOUIS IN EGYPT AND IN PALESTINE.—Barbarous hordes, driven out of Turkistan by the Mongols, and known as Khorasmians, had invaded Palestine under the protection of the sultan of Egypt. Jerusalem fell into their hands and the Holy Sepulchre was profaned. On these tidings Pope Innocent IV., who was presiding at the Council of Lyons, preached the holy war himself. Louis IX., King of France, was the only prince in Europe that responded to the appeal. During a serious illness he fell into a long swoon and was thought dead ; as soon as he revived he vowed to take the cross and to employ his arms in the deliverance of the Eastern Christians (1245). After four years of preparation he embarked at Aigues-Mortes with his wife, Margaret, and his brothers. The fleet sailed to Cyprus, where all the Crusaders, to the number of forty-five thousand, were to assemble. It was decided to undertake the conquest of Egypt first, as the surest means of weakening the power of the sultan of Cairo, who was then

master of Jerusalem. A countless army of Saracens covered the whole coast about the mouths of the Nile, presenting an immense forest of spears and swords. But this spectacle only aroused the ardor of Louis. Without waiting till his vessel had touched the shore, he jumped into the sea, sword in hand ; his soldiers followed him, and in a moment the army of the infidels, already panic-stricken, turned and fled. The strongly-fortified city of Damietta immediately opened its gates to the Crusaders. They made their entry in procession, barefooted, the king marching at their head, and all singing hymns of thanksgiving for so glorious a day (1249).

Louis remained five months at Damietta, awaiting reinforcements. This delay was unfortunate for his army, which lost its discipline and was attacked with an epidemic disease. On the march to Cairo the army was supported on its flank by the fleet, which ascended the Nile, but its advance was checked step by step by the Saracens, who defended every available canal. It required nearly a month to make ten miles. The Saracens in this campaign made great use of the Greek fire, which was a composition almost the same as our gunpowder. Not far from Mansurah the cavalry, having succeeded in fording a wide canal, suddenly fell upon the infidels and put them to flight. The victory would have been complete had the king's brother, the Count of Artois, tempered his valor by prudence. As he hotly pursued the fugitives, he entered the city of Mansurah almost along with them. He was accompanied by the flower of the Christian knights, but, being surrounded and outnumbered by the Saracens,

cens, they were cut to pieces (1250). After this fatal day it was necessary to think of retreat ; but the enemy threatened to cut off all communication between the camp and Damietta. To fill their measure of woe, the dead bodies, heaped along the banks of the Nile, corrupted the waters, and pestilence joined with famine to decimate the army of the Crusaders. It soon became impossible to withstand the incessant attacks of the Saracens. The king himself, worn out by fatigue and sickness, was made prisoner with his two brothers. He appeared as great in chains as on the throne, conducting himself as a Christian whose God is his all, as a hero whose soul rises superior to misfortune. The most terrible menaces failed to daunt his spirit ; even the infidels esteemed him as the most intrepid Christian of the West. Struck with respect and admiration for their captive, they even deliberated whether they should not offer him the throne of Egypt, then vacant by the death of the sultan. They at last decided to make a treaty of peace with him, on condition that he would give 400,000 livres (\$1,500,000) for the ransom of his fellow-captives, and the city of Damietta for his own person, because "it was not meet," said he, "to ransom a king of France for money."

As soon as Louis was free he sailed for Palestine, where he spent four years lavishing cares on the Christians and fortifying the places still in their power. The Old Man of the Mountain sought his alliance and sent him rich presents. The pious monarch did not quit the Holy Land (1254) till the news reached him of the death of his mother, Blanche of Castile, to whom he had left

the title of regent and the government of his kingdom.

EIGHTH CRUSADE (1270); ST. LOUIS BEFORE TUNIS.—St. Louis still wore the cross, and was bent on a fresh expedition against the infidels. The sad tidings spread throughout Europe that Bibars-Bundokdar, one of the conquerors of Mansurah, had become sultan of Egypt and was extending his conquests into Palestine. Acre was now the only city left to the Eastern Christians. Just at this time the French king's brother, Charles of Anjou, who had become master of the Two Sicilies, announced that the king of Tunis was disposed to receive baptism if a Christian army should land in his dominions. St. Louis thought the occasion favorable. After providing for the safety of his kingdom he sailed from Aigues-Mortes for Africa. While encamped on the ruins of Carthage he discovered, to his sorrow, that the king of Tunis, far from being an ally, was a formidable enemy. It became necessary to lay siege to Tunis, which defended itself bravely. Soon the excessive heat, bad water, and worse provisions filled the camp with malignant fevers that carried off nearly half the army. The king himself was seized with illness, and he felt that it was to be mortal. He bore up under this final conflict with all the magnanimity of a Christian hero. Ever true to himself, and equal to all emergencies, he omitted none of the functions of royalty. When he felt his end approaching he gave his son and heir, Philip, wholesome counsels. Then he had himself laid on ashes, and crossing his arms upon his breast, and raising his eyes to heaven, he breathed his last, repeating the words of the Psalmist: “I

shall go into thy house, O Lord, and adore thee in thy holy temple" (1270).

Philip III., the new king of France, aided by his uncle, Charles of Anjou, concluded an honorable peace. The king of Tunis was required to pay the costs of the war, to liberate several thousand Christian captives, and to grant the free exercise of Catholic worship throughout his states. These concessions gloriously ended the last Crusade. Twenty years later (1291) the Eastern Christians lost Acre, their sole remaining city in Palestine.

MATERIAL, POLITICAL, AND RELIGIOUS RESULTS OF THE CRUSADES.—At the end of the thirteenth century Christian Europe had lost all her conquests in the East. Most of the Crusades had ended in disaster, as might naturally be expected from the character of those distant expeditions, the perfidy of the Greeks, and the disorders too common among the Crusaders themselves. However, we should err in supposing that so many thousands of men and immense treasures were sacrificed in vain. The Crusades resulted beneficially, even in a material point of view, for the nations that had undertaken them. Commerce between Europe and Asia, till then monopolized by the Arabs, was diverted from them by the great maritime cities of France and Italy. Venice, Genoa, Pisa, and Marseilles were put in direct communication with the ports of the Levant. Their vessels were freighted with gold, silk, perfumes, ivory, etc.—the rich products of Asia. These precious commodities, spread throughout Europe, stimulated manufactures either for the exchange of products with remote nations or in the imitation of certain fabrics of the East, as tissues

and Damask steel, the cultivation of the mulberry-tree and of the silk-worm, cotton stuffs, saffron and indigo, dyes, etc. Venice learned the secret of glass-making from the Tyrians, and looking-glasses soon superseded metallic mirrors. The windmill, which produces regular motion from the most capricious of elements, was brought from Asia by the Crusaders.

The Crusades had a good effect on the political situation of Europe, and, as long as they lasted, prevented the advance of the infidels upon Constantinople, and in a strategic point of view were a diversion useful in the struggle against the Moors of Spain ; they ended, or suspended, wars between Christian kings ; they extinguished civil wars by turning against the common foe the arms which Christians employed to destroy one another. The Crusades contributed also to the unity of Europe by enrolling all nations and ranks under one standard to share the same sentiments and the same trials and dangers.

The Crusades, inspired by a religious motive, augmented the influence of the Holy See and of the clergy throughout the West. Never was the union between the Church and society so intimate ; never has there been so splendid a proof that the true faith is the strongest bond of social union and the most powerful incentive to heroism. Europe, till then invaded by barbarians upon all sides, arose as one man at the cry of “God wills it !” and in turn became an invader. In her first transport she repulsed the infidels of the East ; she planted the standard of the cross on Calvary, and sent intrepid missionaries to bear the light of the Gospel to the extremities of Asia. But if the Crusades served to propagate the

faith, they were still more useful in the admirable examples of virtue which they exhibited to the nations of the West. For most of the Crusaders they were a magnanimous struggle in which they sacrificed all their worldly interests to the cause of faith and of eternity. Never did so many princes and lords leave possessions, family, and country, with no other prospect on earth than the perils of a distant voyage and a deadly war with unbelievers. This sublime spectacle transported souls and lifted them to heaven. But the glory of God was promoted not only by the arms of the Crusaders but also by science, in the immense labors of scholastic theology, by the fine arts in the rearing of magnificent cathedrals, by the theatre in the edifying representation of the Mysteries, by poesy in the chants consecrated to the exploits of Christian heroes against the Saracens. Charlemagne and his paladins, Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table, were celebrated as models of all Christian and chivalrous virtues; the Spanish Romanceros, the German poems, and even Dante's *Divine Comedy*, received their inspiration from the holy wars. France surpassed all other nations in the number of her poets and the popularity of her epic songs; her language was formed by the graceful pen of the chroniclers of the Crusades, Villehardouin and Joinville. Thus was she recompensed for the glorious part she had sustained in the Crusades.

CHIVALRY.—Chivalry, of which some traces are found in the time of Charlemagne, did not really flourish till the feudal system prevailed, and particularly till the age of the Crusades. The rank of knight was attained only after long trials. At the

age of seven the child destined for this honorable militia entered the castle of some baron to serve him in quality of page or valet. To follow the castellan, or lord of the castle, and his lady to the chase, to launch and to lure the falcon, to wield the spear and the sword, to inure himself to the most arduous exercises, to listen to the minstrel singing the exploits of ancient gallants, and to learn the precepts of religion and the loftiest examples of Christian virtue from the chaplain—such was the training of the aspirant for knighthood. At fourteen he passed from the rank of page to that of esquire. He then had charge of arms and steeds, accompanied the castellan in his journeys and to war, and tried to distinguish himself by some achievement. At twenty-one he could be armed as a knight. After a bath, the symbol of purity, he received successively a white tunic, denoting the innocence which he was to preserve ; a red robe, the blood he would have to shed ; a black robe, the death which awaited him. A fast of twenty-four hours prepared him for the sacraments of penance and the Eucharist ; then came the vigil of arms, which consisted in passing the night in the church at prayer. On the day of the ceremony, after Mass and the sermon, the priest presented a blessed sword to the future knight, who went and knelt before the lord, and solemnly vowed to sacrifice his possessions and very life for religion, the defence of widows and orphans, and, in general, of all the distressed. The lord struck him thrice upon the shoulder with the flat of his sword, saying : “I dub thee knight in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” after which he gave him the accolade, or fraternal embrace, and

girded on his sword. His two sponsors of arms then invested him with all his armor, and put on him the gilt spurs. The new knight, vaulting on to his steed, displayed his agility and skill before the multitude assembled on the castle grounds. A tournament ordinarily closed the ceremony.

The knight who had incurred felony by failing in his duties underwent the infamous penalty of degradation. In presence of twenty or thirty knights without reproach, a king-at-arms accused him of broken faith. He was mounted on a scaffold, where he remained standing in full armor, having before him his shield reversed and hanging to a stake. Beside him twelve priests in surplices chanted the vigils of the dead. At the end of each psalm the heralds-at-arms stripped the condemned of some portion of his armor. When they had quite disarmed him they broke his shield, and the king-at-arms poured a basin of hot water over his head, as if to efface the sacred character of knighthood. The unhappy man was then let down by a rope to the foot of the scaffold, where he was extended on a bier and covered with a pall. Finally the judges, clad in mourning, proceeded to the church, where the priests celebrated the Office of the Dead.

This funeral ceremony sufficiently attests the esteem in which the title of knight was held. Knighthood, influenced by religion, formed a select militia which was animated with sentiments of faith and honor to protect the weak and the oppressed against the excesses of brute force. Hence it exerted an immense influence in all Christian nations. It softened manners, elevated the ideas of right and justice, gave the example of loyalty and courtesy,

and held up to society an ideal at once religious and military, which was quite unknown before its time, and still flourishes the most where the other traditions of knighthood have been the best preserved.

---

## CHAPTER III.

### THE CRUSADES IN EUROPE.

The sovereign pontiffs, while arousing Christian nations to the conquest of the holy places, preach other Crusades in Europe against the Moors of Spain, the Albigenses, and the pagans of the Baltic.

**Sec. 1. Crusades against the Moors of Spain; Alfonso VI., King of Castile (1065–1109); Invasion of the Almoravides (1086–1146).**

During the struggle of the Christians of Spain against the Moors, which we may regard as a standing crusade of nearly eight centuries (711–1492), the dismemberment of the caliphate of Cordova (1031) at one time seemed to betoken the immediate downfall of the infidel dominion. Ferdinand I. the Great, King of Castile, had seized this opportunity of extending the limits of his kingdom to the south; but he unwisely divided it among his three sons (1065). The division and rivalry of Christian kingdoms long prevented the deliverance of Spain. Alfonso VI. the Brave, King of Leon and the Asturias, succeeded in despoiling his two brothers of Castile and Galicia (1073), so that his power was equal to that of his father, Ferdinand. He assumed the title of emperor, and proved himself worthy of it by

his wisdom and the exploits which gave him his surname of the “Light and Buckler of Spain.” Aided by the Cid, he took Toledo after a memorable siege of five years (1085). This city, aptly styled the heart of Spain, became the capital of the king of Castile, who thenceforth threatened all the possessions of the Moors in the south of the peninsula. Fear impelled thirteen emirs, or Moorish kings, to implore the aid of the African Mussulmans, who thrice invaded Spain under the name of Almoravides, Almohades, and Merinides.

The Almoravides, or religious belonging to a sect originating in the middle of the eleventh century, had destroyed the power of the Zeirites in the northwest of Africa. Yusuf, their chief, had founded Morocco (1070) and taken the title of prince of the Mussulmans. As the appeal of the Spanish Moors favored his ambitious projects, he responded to it, and fought a bloody battle with the king of Castile at Zelaca, near Badajoz (1086). Alfonso VI., notwithstanding his heroic courage, was utterly defeated. The cruel Yusuf sent to the cities of his empire forty thousand Christian heads as trophies of his victory. The Moorish princes who had asked his help were forced either to lose their independence or to abandon their states, so that Mussulman Spain passed under the yoke of the Almoravides. Christian Spain, however, opposed a spirited resistance. In response to the call of Alfonso VII. for help a great number of French knights, led by two princes of the house of Burgundy, flocked to his standards. In one year Henry of Burgundy founded the county of Portugal (1094) and the Cid dispossessed the infidels of the kingdom of Valencia, which he kept

till his death (1099).\* Alfonso, by his prudence and activity, would have been well able to defend the frontiers of his kingdom had not a numerous army of Almoravides invaded New Castile. Age and infirmities disabled the dauntless Alfonso from leading his army; he therefore confided the command to his son, Don Sancho, then but eleven years old. The young prince gave battle, but perished in the engagement, and his death involved the rout of the Castilians (1108). His aged father died of grief. The Almoravides, whose territory extended from the south of Morocco to the Ebro, vainly attempted to profit by the victory of Ucles, but they were checked by internal dissensions and the prowess of the Christian knights, to whom the sovereign pontiffs granted the same indulgences as to the Crusaders of the East.

FOUNDATION OF THE KINGDOM OF PORTUGAL (1094-1139).—Alfonso VI., in gratitude for services received from the French knights, gave two of his daughters, Urraca and Teresa, in marriage to the two princes of the house of Burgundy, Raymond, Count of Besançon, and Henry, great-grandson of Robert, King of France. Henry received, as his wife's dower, all the country between the Minho and the Mondego, which was erected into the county of Portugal under the suzerainty of the king of Castile (1094). The French prince gained seventeen

\* The Cid's widow, Ximena, was able to hold her kingdom of Valencia only for three years. When she was driven out by the Almoravides she took away the mortal remains of her husband, and deposited them in the convent of San Pedro at Burgos. There were united all that could remind Spain of her glorious hero; at his side rest the remains of his noble spouse and of his companions-in-arms. Under the trees of the monastery is shown the place where they buried his faithful courser, Babiesa.

victories over the Mussulmans. His son and successor, Affonso I. (1112–1185), resolved to extend the limits of Portugal beyond the Tagus. Having crossed this river, he encountered near Ourique five Moorish kings with a force ten times greater than his own, but the religious ardor of the Portuguese rendered them invincible. Affonso, after receiving by acclamation the title of king and a crown of leaves, marched against the infidels, and made such carnage among them that the five Moorish kings perished in their defeat (1139). The Cortes, or assembly, meeting at Lamego, confirmed the title given by the soldiers by declaring the crown hereditary in the family of Affonso. This pious monarch placed his kingdom under the suzerainty of the Holy See, and thus rendered it independent of Castile. He transferred his residence from Coimbra to Lisbon, which he wrested from the infidels (1147). The terrified Moors for the second time called upon the Africans for aid against the king of Portugal and the other sovereigns of Christian Spain.

ALFONSO I., EL BATALLADOR (1105–1134).—ALFONSO VIII., RAYMONDEZ (1126–1157).—Alfonso VI., King of Castile, had left the crown to his eldest daughter, Urraca, who was the widow of Raymond, but again married to Alfonso I., the Battler, King of Aragon and Navarre. Thus all the Christian states of the peninsula were united under one sceptre (1109), and Alfonso's only thought was to enlarge them at the expense of the infidels. But Urraca's opposition was Spain's misfortune. This princess, of a haughty temper and of loose morals, excited rebellion against her husband, separated from him (1114), and governed Castile alone in the name of

her son by her former marriage, Alfonso VIII., Raymond. Alfonso the Battler, confined to the kingdoms of Aragon and Navarre, continued his conquests over the Mussulmans ; he took Saragossa from them (1118) and made it his capital. When Tarragona fell into his hands he became master of the valley of the Ebro. The Christians of Andalusia called upon him for help, and he set out from Saragossa, crossed Moslem Spain, and terrified the city of Granada, which he had the hardihood to besiege. In fulfilment of a vow made at the beginning of the crusade he went as far as the sea near Malaga, entered a bark, and indulged in the sport of fishing (1125). He desired to raise the courage of the Christians by showing them that a king of Aragon, if so disposed, might come all the way from Saragossa through an enemy's country, and amuse himself fishing on the coasts of Africa just as if in his own dominions. This valiant monarch, victorious over the infidels in twenty-nine battles, lost his life in the thirtieth. Aragon, weakened by the loss of Navarre, which it had held for fifty-eight years (1076–1134), was unable to carry on the struggle against the Mussulmans unless helped by the king of Castile.

Alfonso VIII., proclaimed king of Leon in 1112, had obtained also the government of Castile at the death of his mother, Urraca (1126). This prince was worthy of founding the Burgundian dynasty. After repulsing the Moors of Aragon and enforcing his suzerainty in Navarre, he received from the Cortes of Leon the title of Emperor of Spain (1135). He extended the frontiers of his states towards the south, drove the infidels from Calatrava, and took from them even the city and port of Almeria ; and this

capture, occurring at the same time as that of Lisbon, led to the invasion of the Almohades.

THE ALMOHADES (1146-1248); BATTLE OF LAS-NAVAS DE TOLOSA (1212).—The Almohades, or unitarians, had founded, in the opening of the twelfth century, a religious and military sect which professed to restore in all its purity the worship of one God and to exterminate the Christians. Abd-el-Mumen, head of the Arabian dynasty of the Almohades, put an end to the sway of the Almoravides by seizing upon Morocco, after a siege which cost the lives of two hundred thousand inhabitants (1146). He wrested the cities of Tunis and Tripoli from the Normans of Sicily, and soon extended his empire over all Northern Africa as far as Egypt. He had an equal hatred for the Almoravides and the Christians. He made an alliance with the Moors to attack them in Andalusia. The conquest of this province was completed after eleven years by the taking of Granada (1157) and by the defeat of Alfonso VIII., who died of grief.

This prince had unwisely divided his territories between his two sons, who became respectively kings of Castile and of Leon. The independence of the two crowns, which lasted seventy-three years (1157-1230), would have compromised the safety of Spain had it not been for the organization of a permanent militia, which offered the loftiest examples of religious and patriotic devotion. Castile was defended by the military order of Calatrava (1158), to which was afterwards affiliated the order of Alcantara, founded in 1176. The king of Leon instituted the no less celebrated order of St. James (San Jago) of Compostella (1161). Affonso I., Henriquez, King of

Portugal, having established the order of Avisa (1166), found the knights useful auxiliaries in repelling the attacks of the infidels. The king of the Almohades, who threatened Lisbon, was defeated and slain at Santarem (1184). Yacub, his son and heir, was more successful in the war against the king of Castile, Alfonso IX., the Magnanimous, the grandson of Alfonso Raymondez. The battle of Alarcos (1095) cost the lives of thirty thousand Christians, and the king of Castile himself came near perishing in this disaster.

What rendered the power of the Almohades the more to be feared was their alliance with Sancho VII., King of Navarre, who counted on them to help extend his rule throughout Christian Spain. This ambitious prince derived no other result from his defection than the loss of the three provinces of Biscay, Alava, and Guipuzcoa, which were taken from him by Alfonso IX. (1199) and joined to Castile. Remorse of conscience and the solicitations of the sovereign pontiff finally induced him to take part against the infidels. The new king of Morocco, Mohammed, son of Yacub, had proclaimed the holy war, and had set on foot an army of 600,000 men, at whose head he threatened a general invasion. Christian Europe was alarmed. On the appeal of Innocent III. a host of Italian, German, and French Crusaders joined the Spaniards against the common foe. The army assembled around Toledo resolutely marched to the encounter of the Mussulmans. Prayer and the reception of the sacraments prepared the warriors for a battle which was to decide the fate of Spain and of Christendom. From afar could be seen the countless troops of the enemy drawn up

in the plains (Las Navas) of Tolosa (July 16, 1212). King Mohammed, covered with a black mantle, with his sword in one hand and the Koran in the other, gave the signal of battle. At the first onslaught the vanguard of the Castilians, overpowered by numbers, fell back upon the centre, but the Knights of the Temple and those of Calatrava retrieved the disadvantage. Then Alfonso IX. ordered his royal banner, bearing the image of the Blessed Virgin, to be unfurled alongside of the cross ; the archbishops of Toledo and Narbonne and other prelates passed along the ranks and animated the Crusaders. Driving back the dense masses of the infidels, they penetrated to the centre, which they found defended with iron chains. The Almohades there made a desperate resistance. But Alfonso, with Pedro II. of Aragon on his left, and Sancho VII. of Navarre on his right, burst the chains and hewed Mohammed's guard to pieces. Mohammed himself fled in great haste. "God alone is just," said he, "and the devil is perfidious." The remnant of his army, pursued during its four hours' retreat, was nearly annihilated ; the Mussulmans, according to their historians, lost on that day 500,000 men. The Christians, whose losses were trivial, took immense booty. The king of Castile sent the tent and standard of Mohammed to Pope Innocent III., who placed these glorious trophies in the basilica of St. Peter. Every year in Toledo the feast of the "Triumph of the Cross" was celebrated in thanksgiving for this great victory, which saved Christian Spain and broke the power of the Mussulmans.

ENLARGEMENT OF THE FOUR CHRISTIAN KINGDOMS OF SPAIN ; JAMES I., THE CONQUEROR (1216-

1276); ST. FERDINAND III. (1214–1252); AND ALFONSO X., THE WISE (1252–1284).—As all the Christian kingdoms of Spain had contributed to the victory of Tolosa, all were entitled, more or less, to the profits. Sancho VII., King of Navarre, obtained of Alfonso X. the restitution of several important places, because, as he was surrounded on all sides by the kingdoms of Castile, France, and Aragon, he could not undertake conquests upon the infidels. At his death (1234) his nephew, Theobald IV., Count of Champagne, inherited Navarre.

Portugal, already enlarged under Affonso I. by Estramadura and Alentejo, reached its modern limits by the conquest of Algarve (1264).

Raymond Berenger, Count of Barcelona, had espoused Petronilla, a niece of Alfonso the Battler. This founder of a new dynasty occupied the throne in 1137, and added the counties of Cerdagne and of Provence, as well as several fiefs of Languedoc, to the crown of Catalonia. His grandson, Pedro II. (1196–1213), acquired the seigniory of Montpellier also (1204), whose sole heiress he had espoused. This prince, who had distinguished himself by his courage against the infidels at Tolosa, perished the following year fighting against the Albigenses. God reserved to his son, James I., the Conqueror, the honor of gathering the fruits of the victory of Tolosa. After the struggle of four years James I. remained master of the Balearic Isles (1233) and founded the kingdom of Majorca. He effected a not less important conquest by driving the infidels out of the kingdom of Valencia (1238). This great prince, as zealous in promoting the interests of religion as those of his crown, was embarking for an

Eastern Crusade when a tempest drove his vessels upon the coasts of Aragon. At all events he was enabled to impose an annual tribute upon the Mussulmans of Granada, Tlemcen, and Tunis. By the marriage of his eldest son to the daughter of Manfred he facilitated the reunion of Sicily. He was the first to understand that, as Aragon was hemmed in by Castile, it should extend its power upon the Mediterranean, as Portugal, in a like position, directed its activity to the ocean and the African coast.

Castile, in the centre, became the most powerful kingdom of Spain under Ferdinand III., the Saint (1217–1252), son of Alfonso, King of Leon. On the death of his father (1230) Ferdinand united Castile to the kingdom of Leon. Endowed with a courage equal to his piety and wisdom, he in person directed all his forces against the Almohades and the Moors of Andalusia. He took Cordova after a long siege (1235). His first care was to purify the principal mosque of the city and to dedicate it to the Virgin Mary, and he compelled the Moors to carry on their backs to Compostella the large bells which Al-Mansur had brought to Cordova on the backs of Christians. The holy king took no rest until he had completed the triumph of the cross over Islam. After the taking of Jaén he made Ben Al-Hamar, founder of the kingdom of Granada, his tributary and vassal (1245). He laid siege to Seville for the purpose of depriving the Almohades of their last bulwark in Spain. This, too, was the most fertile and highly cultivated part of Andalusia. The inhabitants, having withdrawn into the city, made a brave resistance for nearly two years, when they were forced to capitulate, to the number of three hundred thou-

sand, and to seek refuge in the kingdom of Granada.

The king of Castile made a solemn entrance into Seville and ordered all the mosques to be transformed into churches. Xeres, Cadiz, and many other places were constrained to open their gates to the conqueror; so that the kingdom of Castile extended across the peninsula from the Bay of Biscay to the Straits of Gibraltar.

St. Ferdinand, in the ardor of his zeal, had formed the project of carrying the war into Africa. His fleet became mistress of the sea by a naval victory over Morocco (1251), but death snatched him away from the love of his subjects just as he was going to embark on a new crusade. This monarch's virtues still more than his conquests made him worthy to be compared to St. Louis, his cousin-german. Like the latter, he was a wise legislator; he promulgated a fundamental law to prevent the division of the monarchy, which was declared indivisible, with right of succession to the throne by primogeniture. The protector of science and letters, he founded the University of Salamanca. A touching instance of his solicitude for the happiness of his subjects is cited. Being counselled to levy an extraordinary tax on the occasion of a new war against the Moors, he exclaimed: "God forbid! Providence will aid me by other means. I fear the sighs and tears of a poor woman more than all the armies of the Mussulmans."

Alfonso X., surnamed the Wise or Learned (1252-1284), was nearly always at war, either to preserve his father's conquests or to repress the revolts of his subjects and of his near kinsmen. His brother having leagued against him with the emir of Niebla,

he laid siege to that place (1257). It was then, it is said, the Arabs used gunpowder for the first time in Europe. Four years afterwards, on the same day and at the same hour, the Mussulmans suddenly arose in Andalusia, seized arms, and massacred the Christians. The king of Granada had instigated the revolt, hoping to recover his independence and to extend his petty kingdom. But James I., the Conqueror, father-in-law of Alfonso, completed the conquest of the kingdom of Murcia for Castile (1265). Alfonso himself, having defeated the king of Granada, compelled him to pay tribute (1266). The Mussulmans were thus driven back between the coast and the kingdom of Castile, whose suzerainty they acknowledged. Alfonso imprudently undertook to weaken them still more by disseminating a spirit of revolt among them, which only led them to invite a third invasion of Africans, the Merinides, who had overturned the power of the Almohades in Morocco.

The vainglorious Alfonso also intrigued for the title of emperor of Germany. To gain partisans in the empire he ground down his subjects with onerous taxes, and even neglected to defend them against the Moors. But his youngest son, Don Sancho, who had distinguished himself against the infidels, raised the standard of revolt. Alfonso, despoiled of authority by his own son, died of grief. This prince left many remarkable writings, among others his astronomical tables, but his errors and misfortunes sufficiently prove that he was wanting in the qualities most essential for government. For preferring to study the motions of the heavenly bodies rather than the interests of his subjects Alfonso X. de-

served this epitaph : “ Whilst he contemplated the glory of the firmament, he lost that of earth.”

### Sec. 2. Crusade against the Albigenses (1208-1229).

THE HERESY OF THE ALBIGENSES ; ASSASSINATION OF PETER OF CASTELNAU (1208).—The heresy of the Albigenses took its name from the diocese of Albi, where it most prevailed. This heresy had been brought from the East by way of Bulgaria and Lombardy, whence it spread into Languedoc and all the neighboring countries. It was derived from the Manicheans and Arians. It admitted the existence of two principles, one good, the other evil ; it denied the divinity of Jesus Christ, rejected the ecclesiastical hierarchy, marriage and the other sacraments, and authorized excesses not less subversive of society than of religion. Many regions in Languedoc were the theatre of the most grievous disorders, which the clergy, having lost all power, were unable to remedy. Churches were deserted and the priests exposed to all manner of outrages. The preaching of St. Dominic and other missionaries was powerless against the fanaticism of the Albigenses. What added to the audacity of the sectaries was the support given them by the principal lords of the country, the counts of Toulouse and Foix, the viscounts of Béarn and of Béziers. Raymond VI., Count of Toulouse, instead of heeding the salutary exhortations of Peter of Castelnau, a monk of Citeaux and legate of the Holy See, obstinately favored the progress of the dangerous heresy. The legate launched a sentence of excommunication against him. One of the count's followers took vengeance. Peter of Castelnau, while

crossing the Rhone, fell under the blows of the assassin, saying : “ Forgive him, O Lord ! as I forgive him.”

Pope Innocent III., watchful of the integrity of the Christian faith, kept alive the zeal of the king of France and of the bishops and missionaries whom he himself had sent to Languedoc. But the murder of his legate proved that he could no longer rely on persuasion ; he excommunicated the count of Toulouse, and caused a crusade against the heretics to be preached. Their impiety and the violence they exercised upon Catholics had excited intense indignation, so that in a few weeks an army of fifty thousand Crusaders was assembled.

**SIMON DE MONTFORT (1208-1218) ; BATTLE OF MURET (1213).**—The duke of Burgundy and many other French lords took part in the crusade against the Albigenses ; but none seemed worthier of being commander-in-chief than Simon, Count of Montfort, who combined a lively faith with the bravery and loyalty of an accomplished knight. In the fourth Crusade he withdrew from his comrades-in-arms before Zara to join the holy war in Palestine against the Mussulmans. His trust in God made him daring and invincible on the battle-field. “ The whole Church is praying for me,” said he ; “ I cannot fall.” His prodigies of valor against the heretics won him the glorious surname of the “ New Machabeus.” With such a leader the crusaders marched against the Albigenses with enthusiasm. Raymond VI., to save his dominions, had asked and obtained reconciliation with the Church. The war began in the territory of the viscount of Béziers, the self-willed fomenter of the heresy. The city of Béziers, taken

by assault, was given up to fire and slaughter by the undisciplined bands who had accompanied the crusaders (1209). Carcassone, Albi, Pamiers, and several other places were successively forced to capitulate. The viscount of Béziers, being made prisoner, died soon after, and Simon de Montfort received his inheritance.

A great number of crusaders had already quitted Languedoc. This was the opportunity which Raymond VI. awaited to take up arms. The success did not answer his expectations, and he repaired to Rome to interest Pope Innocent III. in his behalf. He there met with a kind reception ; but the legate and the Council of Arles proposed conditions which he refused to accept. War was rekindled with fresh fury. Simon, attacked in Castelnaudary by the counts of Toulouse and Foix, left the city at the head of a few knights, and fell upon his foes with such impetuosity that they were speedily routed (1212). In thanksgiving for this brilliant victory he returned barefoot to the church of Castelnaudary. Raymond VI., trembling for his capital, asked the aid of Pedro II., King of Aragon. The latter hastened to Languedoc with an army fifty thousand strong. His design was to seize the little place of Muret, defended by a feeble garrison ; but Simon, wishing to save it at all costs, hastened thither with only two thousand men. Before the battle he laid his sword upon the altar and prayed thus : “ O Lord ! all unworthy as I am, thou hast nevertheless chosen me to defend thy cause. I take this sword from thy altar ; grant that, wielding it for thy glory, I may wield it with justice.” His skilful dispositions, as well as his irresistible courage, disconcerted the con-

federates from the first ; the death of the king of Aragon, their leader and a most redoubtable knight, completed their rout (1213). The conqueror, having given public thanks to God, sold the dead king's armor and war-horse for the benefit of the poor.

That day ruined the cause of Raymond VI. The Ecumenical Council of Lateran judged that but one man was able to defend the county of Toulouse against the scourge of heresy, and it therefore conferred it upon the conqueror of Muret, who received its investiture from Philip Augustus, King of France (1215). Raymond, assisted by his son, continued hostilities ; he even got possession again of Toulouse. Simon de Montfort at once laid siege to that important place. One morning, while he was in church, news was brought him that the garrison, by an abrupt sortie, had surprised his troops and was about to cut them to pieces. "Let me," said he to the messenger, "first assist at the divine mysteries and behold the pledge of our redemption." When the priest had elevated the sacred Host the devout knight, on his knees and raising his hands to heaven, exclaimed : "Now, Lord, let thy servant depart" ; then turning to his companions-in-arms, "Let us go," said he, "and die, if needs be, for Him who vouchsafed to die for us." In a few moments he renewed the combat and drove the enemy beyond the city walls ; but a stone, hurled by an engine of the besieged, struck him on the head and killed him on the spot. The death of the Christian hero was followed by the retreat of the crusaders (1218).

AMAURY DE MONTFORT AND LOUIS VIII.; TREATY OF PARIS (1229).—Simon's son Amaury had not the requisite qualities to defend his father's heritage.

Abandoned by nearly all the knights, and constantly worsted by Raymond, he ceded his rights to the king of France, Louis VIII., the Lion. Louis, at the head of fifty thousand men, laid siege to Avignon, which capitulated after a vigorous resistance of three months. This event led to the conquest of all the country as far as Toulouse. The sudden death of Louis (1226) afforded some respite to Raymond VII., the son and successor of Raymond VI. But, the young count, being surrounded by ruined or dispirited partisans, consented to a reconciliation with the Church, and signed the treaty of Meaux, which was ratified at Paris the following year. Raymond ceded to St. Louis Lower Languedoc, and to the Holy See the county of Venaissin, but he retained the county of Toulouse, which, on his demise, was to form the dower of his daughter Jeanne, wife of Alfonso, the king's brother. This treaty secured the triumph of the true faith over heresy in Languedoc. The count of Toulouse, true to his word, acted with rigor towards the Albigenses; the greater number abjured their errors, while others emigrated to Provence, where they blended with the sectaries known as Waldenses, or Vaudois.

### Sec. 3. Crusades against the Pagans of the Baltic in the Thirteenth Century.

CONVERSION OF LIVONIA AND ESTHONIA; THE KNIGHTS OF THE SWORD (1204-1237).—Religion, already flourishing in Northern Germany and Scandinavia, had not yet reached the savage tribes on the Baltic shores from the Vistula to the Gulf of Finland. Till the end of the twelfth century the savage humor of the pagans had opposed an

insurmountable obstacle to the zeal of the missionaries and the efforts of the German knights who had taken the cross at the voice of Pope Celestine III. A canon of Bremen, Albert of Alperden, was more fortunate. Accompanied by new crusaders, he landed at the mouth of the Duna and founded Riga, of which he was named bishop (1201). This judicious prelate, wishing to secure a prosperous future for religion, divided Livonia into fiefs, most of which he bestowed on such German lords as were able to repel the incursions of the pagans. The same thought also inspired him with the design of organizing a standing army to defend the country (1204). The new religious and military order, approved by Pope Innocent III., followed the rule of the Templars. Its members, in the beginning called "Brothers of the Militia of Christ," or "Knights of Livonia," are better known as "Knights of the Sword," because two red swords were embroidered on their white mantle. They received a third of Livonia, with the right of possessing future conquests in the neighboring country. A few years sufficed for the extirpation of paganism in Livonia, which was erected into a fief and principality of the empire. The emperor, Philip of Suabia, gave the investiture of it to the bishop of Riga. It was an admitted principle in the Middle Ages that the pope and emperor could dispose at will of the lands of pagans.

The Esthonians, who dwelt in the north of Livonia, were forced to yield to the prowess of the Knights of the Sword and the Danish crusaders. Idolatry disappeared from their country (1223), and Albert of Alperden founded two bishoprics there. His disputes with the Knights of the Sword concerning

episcopal jurisdiction induced these knights to unite themselves with the Teutonic Order.

THE TEUTONIC ORDER IN PRUSSIA (1226-1283).—The Prussians occupied all the country between the Vistula and the Niemen. They were a warlike people, who sacrificed human victims to their monstrous divinities. Their first apostle, St. Adalbert, Bishop of Prague, had the palm of martyrdom for his zeal (997). The Prussians remained in the darkness of paganism till a Polish prince of Culm protected the labors of a missionary named Christian, who became the first bishop of Prussia (1214). Pope Innocent III. authorized this prelate to employ the arms of the Crusaders against the attacks of the pagans. Still, a permanent militia was needed to hold in check indefatigable foes, and Christian founded the order of "Brothers of the Militia of Christ in Prussia" (1224). The new knights having nearly all perished in battle, appeal was made to the knights of the Teutonic Order, who received from Pope Honorius III. and the Emperor Frederick II. the country of Culm, with all the territory they could conquer from the pagans. From that time began a furious war which lasted half a century, notwithstanding constant help from German crusaders and from Ottocar II., King of Bohemia. The Prussians were supported by the Russians and Lithuanians, who remained idolaters till the end of the fourteenth century. Only in 1283 did all Prussia become Christian. The Teutonic Order had founded the already flourishing cities of Thorn, Marienburg, and Königsberg, which were successively the capitals of the country. The knights, enriched by their conquests, fell away from their primitive purity,

and their grand master, Albert of Brandenburg, embraced the so-called reform of Luther to assume the title of prince of Prussia (1525). The Knights of the Sword then recovered their independence ; but thirty-six years later their grand master was guilty of scandalous apostasy, and the order ceased to exist (1561).

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### FRANCE, ENGLAND, AND IRELAND.

France and England, whose rivalry begins with William the Conqueror, present a striking contrast in their civil history : in France Capetian royalty, at first feeble, continually grows in power up to the end of the thirteenth century ; in England royalty, at first mighty, is forced, in the thirteenth century, to relinquish a part of its prerogatives.

#### Sec. 1. Progress of Royalty in France ; *Emancipation of Cities.*

PHILIP I. (1060–1108) ; BEGINNING OF THE RIVALRY WITH ENGLAND.—Philip I., son of Henry I., at the age of seven became king of France under the tutelage of his uncle, Baldwin, Count of Flanders. In a reign of forty-eight years this indolent prince made but one war, in person, to secure Flanders to the grandson of his guardian, and let himself be worsted at Cassel (1071). Although an indifferent spectator of the first Crusade and other stirring events of that epoch, he was uneasy at the great power of his vassal, the duke of Normandy, who had become king of England. If he dared not declare war against William the Conqueror, he sought at least to raise difficulties against him either

by abetting the duke of Brittany, who refused homage, or by harboring his eldest son, Robert, surnamed Curt-Hose, or Short-Shanks, who claimed the duchy of Normandy. A coarse jest uttered by Philip on his corpulence served William as a pretext to march on Mantes, which he burnt ; but in the midst of the fire his horse stumbled, and he received a wound which hurried him to the tomb (1087). The king of France, rid of so dangerous an enemy, embroiled himself in fresh difficulties by his simony and scandalous conduct ; but he ended by being reconciled with the Church.

LOUIS VI. (1108-1137); WARS AGAINST THE BARONS AND AGAINST THE ENGLISH.—Louis VI., the Fat, had scarcely ascended the throne than he succeeded in putting down the open brigandage of some of the barons, who amused themselves by ravaging the neighborhood of Paris. Widening his field of action little by little, he made his authority respected by the barons of the south, and even by the powerful duke of Aquitaine ; in the north he claimed suzerainty over the county of Flanders, the investiture of which he conferred on William Cliton, son of the unfortunate Robert Curt-Hose. Henry I. of England was offended by the protection given to a prince whom he persecuted, and he defeated the French king at Brenneville. Pope Calixtus II., then a refugee in France, succeeded in reconciling the two rivals. But the Emperor Henry V., father-in-law of the king of England, chastised Louis for harboring the sovereign pontiff. Then Louis, seizing the oriflamme in the abbey of St. Denis for the first time, summoned around him all the vassals and the communal militia of the kingdom (1124). The empe-

ror, alarmed, withdrew without striking a blow ; but his death brought new danger to France, for his widow, Matilda, married Geoffrey Plantagenet, Count of Anjou. Louis VI., by way of compensation, married his eldest son to Eleanor of Guienne, heiress of the duchy of Aquitaine. This wise monarch had reason to hope that after his death the royal authority would preserve the power he had given it by the help of the clergy and the judicious counsels of his friend Suger, the abbot of St. Denis.

EMANCIPATION OF THE TOWNS; MUNICIPAL CITIES, PRIVILEGED TOWNS, ETC.—It was not Louis the Fat, as has been asserted, who founded communes or districts, several of which existed before his time, but he profited by his alliance with the clergy to have himself declared head of all the confraternities and armed leagues which were organized in every diocese to arrest and punish the disturbers of the peace. The emancipation of the towns in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was due not to the intervention of royalty but to the love of liberty of the inhabitants themselves. By their industry and commercial enterprise many of them had acquired wealth, which they naturally desired to enjoy free from the interference of the neighboring nobility. Besides, a few cities, particularly in Italy and in Southern France, continued to hold to the traditions, more or less modified, of the Roman municipality ; so that these ancient Roman cities were the first to give an example of complete municipal independence, or of a free city nominally subject to the suzerainty of a prince or baron. Every municipal city was a sort of republic, governing itself by magistrates, who were elected by the citizens, and whom

they designated as consuls, capitularies, senators, syndics, wardens, or aldermen, etc. The most famous municipal cities were Pisa, Genoa, Venice, Milan, Bergamo, Bologna, and others, which constituted in the twelfth century the “Lombard League” in Italy ; Marseilles, Avignon, Arles (1131), Béziers, Montpellier (1141), Toulouse (1183), etc., in France ; Brussels, Ghent (1180), Bruges, etc., in Flanders ; Strassburg (1236), Treves, Mentz (1255), Cologne, Frankfort-on-the-Main (1257), etc., in Germany.

In regard to the origin of communes, it must be attributed not, as has been said, to the tradition of the Germanic tribe assembled about its chief, but to the custom of the faithful in every parish banding together by oath to enforce the Truce of God. The thought naturally occurred to them to employ the same means to secure their independence. The commune was an association of all the inhabitants, which met in the church or on the public square, pledged to lend mutual aid in defence of the franchises or liberties of the city as guaranteed in a charter. This charter was granted by their lord freely, by force, or on the payment of a sum of money, and gave the inhabitants the right of paying only fixed contributions, of being exempt from all personal servitude, and it empowered them to administer the commune themselves by naming their own magistrates, mayors, burgesses or aldermen, and jurors. Each commune had a city hall, a particular seal, and a belfry, surmounted by a clock, as a symbol of independence. On the least sign of alarm the signal-man watching in the belfry sounded the tocsin to call the communal militia to arms.

His ordinary duty was to announce the hour of the assembly and the curfew.

Besides communal and municipal cities, there were many which, though having no charter or independent administration, nevertheless possessed important franchises which the king or lords had granted them either in consideration of their commerce and manufactures or for the security of their life and property. These were privileged cities or commonalities. Their condition soon appeared preferable to that of the communes, which were always a prey to intestine discord when they were not engaged in a struggle with the lords. Hence communes from the thirteenth century gave up their charters to place themselves under the protection of the royal authority. The most remarkable result of the emancipation of cities was the importance acquired by the middle class, or burghers, who in France composed the Third Estate (*tiers état*).

**LOUIS VII., THE YOUNGER (1137-1180); HIS RIVALRY WITH HENRY II.**—Louis VII., the Younger, inherited neither the wisdom nor the firmness of his father. Having refused to acknowledge a new archbishop of Bourges appointed by Pope Innocent II., he was drawn into an unfortunate war, notorious for the burning of Vitry. His remorse for this deed led him to undertake the second Crusade, which, even though he lost his army in it, turned out less fatal to his kingdom than his misunderstanding with his capricious and frivolous queen. On his return he obtained a divorce from Eleanor of Guienne, who soon gave her hand to Henry Plantagenet, a son of Geoffrey and Matilda (1152). Two years later Henry was proclaimed king of England. He had already

inherited, by his mother, the duchy of Normandy, and by his father Anjou, Maine, and Touraine; and he received as his wife's dower the extensive duchy of Aquitaine, stretching from the Loire to the Pyrenees. Thus the new king of England was master of all Western France, save Brittany, whose alliance he secured by obtaining the hand of its heiress, Constance, for his son Geoffrey. Against so doughty a rival the king of France thought himself justified in encouraging the revolt of his children and patronizing St. Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury. Louis VII. has the glory of having checked the power of Henry II., and of having wisely governed his kingdom by the counsels of his minister, Suger.

PHILIP II. (1180–1223); HIS CONQUESTS; VICTORY OF BOUVINES (1214).—Philip II., surnamed Augustus, ascended the throne at the age of fifteen. Endowed with rare prudence and unyielding firmness, he baffled the hopes which his enemies had founded on his youth. Having married Isabella of Hainaut, a descendant of Charlemagne, he encouraged a new revolt of the sons of Henry II., who died of grief. During the third Crusade Richard Cœur de Lion, the new king of England, wounded the overbearing disposition of his suzerain, the king of France. Philip, upon his hasty return to France, meanly determined to profit by the absence of his rival, and at once set about the conquest of Normandy. But Richard, once released, had little difficulty in recovering all that he had lost, and obtained a truce of five years through the mediation of Innocent III. At his death (1199) John Lackland, not content with usurping the crown from his nephew,

Arthur of Brittany, imprisoned him, murdered him with his own hand, and threw his corpse into the Seine near Rouen. This horrible assassination excited universal indignation. The king of France, ever ready to profit by the crimes or the misfortunes of others, summoned the English monarch, who was his vassal as duke of Normandy, to appear before the court of peers (1203). John gave no heed to the summons, and was declared guilty of felony and sentenced to forfeit all his possessions in France. Philip, at the head of a large army, fell upon Normandy, and added that fair province to the crown, three hundred years after its cession to the Normans by Charles the Simple. The conqueror, taking advantage of the incapacity of John Lackland, subjected Touraine, Maine, Anjou, and Poitou ; so that there remained to the king of England but the third of his possessions on the Continent.

John saw himself about to lose his crown, which was offered to the king of France. To avert the danger he declared himself a vassal of the Holy See and sought a reconciliation with Pope Innocent III. For the purpose of recovering the provinces which Philip Augustus had taken from him, he formed a league against that monarch, in which the Emperor Otho IV., Ferrand, Count of Flanders, and a host of other lords mindful of the ambition of France, took part. Nevertheless the king of England was beaten, near Angers, by Prince Louis the Lion, and his allies were utterly vanquished by Philip Augustus at Bouvines, near Lille (1214). This was a decisive triumph for France ; it blasted the hopes of her enemies, and secured her in the possession of the provinces taken from the English, as well as Artois

and nearly all Picardy. What equally redounded to the glory of Philip was his wisdom in regulating the administration of his kingdom: he gave the force of law to the decision of the court of peers; restored order by means of an efficient police; and created seventy-eight provosts, entrusted with everything regarding the army, finances, and justice, under the supervision of bailiffs, known as seneschals in the south of France. Thus the royal authority, recovering its prestige, had nothing more to fear from the encroachments of the great nobles.

**LOUIS VIII., THE LION (1223-1226).**—The Capetian dynasty was so firmly established that Philip Augustus had judged it useless to place his eldest son, Louis the Lion, upon the throne beside him in imitation of his predecessors. The young prince, at the invitation of the disaffected English barons, had been in hopes of wearing the crown of England. Having become king of France, he refused to restore to Henry III., son of John Lackland, the provinces confiscated by Philip Augustus; in a few weeks he had routed the English from all their possessions, except Bordeaux and Gascony (1224). We have seen that, after a successful crusade against the Albigenses, Louis VIII. suddenly died in Auvergne. By his marriage with Blanche of Castile he left four sons and one daughter: Louis, the eldest, who succeeded him; Robert, Count of Artois; Alphonse, Count of Poitiers; Charles, Count of Anjou; and Isabella.

**ST. LOUIS (1226-1270); HIS WARS AND HIS GOVERNMENT.**—Louis IX., being but eleven years old, was under the guardianship of his mother, Blanche of Castile, who was regent. This firm, tal-

ented, and virtuous princess knew how to govern, and to make her son a great king and a great saint. The more powerful lords, having taken arms to reassert their independence, were forced to return to their duty. The treaty of Paris terminated the Albigensian war (1229), which for twenty years had desolated the southern provinces. Louis, having taken the reins of government in hand, completed what his mother had so well begun ; he marched in person against Hugh de Lusignan, Count of La Marche, a rebel vassal who had the support of the king of England. The king of France, victorious at Taillebourg and again under the walls of Saintes, pursued the flying English to the Garonne (1242). The count of La Marche, having cast himself at his feet, obtained pardon by ceding a part of his domains. The English monarch gladly signed a treaty of peace. Several years afterwards St. Louis was generous enough, in the treaty of Abbeville, to give Henry III. of England all the provinces between the Garonne and Charente, but on condition of his paying liege homage for them to the king of France.

When St. Louis, in the first Crusade, became prisoner of the infidels, the account of his misfortunes filled France with mourning. Many peasants took arms to rescue him, but they committed such excesses at Paris and Orleans that Blanche had to employ force to disperse them. On the death of this wise princess Louis hastened back to his kingdom, which he found as tranquil and flourishing as he had left it. The holy king continued to labor for the welfare of his people by enacting wise laws ; he forbade the private wars which the lords had been in the habit of waging with one another on trivial pretexts ;

he abolished in his own domains the proof of innocence by duel ; he took care to increase the facilities for a direct appeal to royal justice ; and he reserved the right of coining money for himself. To superintend the provosts and bailiffs he sent into the provinces "royal inquisitors," authorized to reform abuses. The greatest lords, if guilty, never escaped with impunity. The monarch delighted to render justice, in person, to the lowliest of his subjects. Dispensing with the annoying conventionalities of rank, he would pace the wood of Vincennes, or, seated at the foot of a wide-spreading oak, would give audience to common people, whom no usher or guard hindered from laying open their grievances.

Renowned throughout Europe for his wisdom and virtue, Louis was chosen as arbiter of affairs of the utmost importance. The differences between the English barons and Henry III. were left to his arbitration, and his decision conciliated the royal prerogatives with the respect due to the ancient liberties of England. But, despite solicitations, he refused to intervene between the sovereign pontiff and Frederick II., as the latter was an excommunicated prince. He declined the crown of the Two Sicilies offered him by Urban IV., but left his brother free to conquer Southern Italy (1266). But the all-absorbing idea of Louis's life was to undertake another Crusade. We have seen that from the time of his arrival under the walls of Tunis he constantly gave the example of all the loftiest Christian virtues (1270). He was the most accomplished hero of his age, and to him France owes much of the glory which was attributed to her during mediæval times.

**Sec. 2. England; the Norman Kings (1066–1154) and the First Four Plantagenets (1154–1272); Ancient Ireland; Invasion of Ireland (1171); Magna Charta (1215).**

WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR (1066–1087) AND WILLIAM RUFUS (1087–1100).—William, Duke of Normandy, had conquered England by the victory of Hastings (1066), and secured his power by despoiling the vanquished in favor of the Normans. After trampling out the last revolt of the Anglo-Saxons, he forced the king of Scotland to acknowledge his suzerainty (1073), but he found a bitter rival in Philip I. of France. William died at Mantes, and left three sons: the eldest, Robert, had the duchy of Normandy; the second, William, surnamed Rufus from his red hair, inherited the crown of England; the third, Henry, received only a pittance, of which when he complained his father said to him: “Patience, my son; you will one day inherit the fortunes of both your brothers.”

William Rufus had at first to defend his crown against his eldest brother. To enlist the Anglo-Saxons in his favor he gave them back their right to hunt and all their other ancient liberties. Robert, attacked in Normandy by superior forces, was compelled to relinquish his pretensions. As he needed money to take part in the first Crusade, he offered William the government of Normandy for five years for the sum of \$92,500 (1095). The king of England, having nothing further to fear, gave full scope to his passions. Not content with suppressing the very liberties he had restored, he burdened his subjects with heavy taxes and multiplied expedients to

glut his avarice. As if he had repented of having at first followed the wholesome counsels of Lanfranc, the Archbishop of Canterbury, he raised one of his courtiers to the archbishopric of Durham, and made him the accomplice of his tyranny. This unworthy prelate received the name of Flambard, from his being a fiery scourge to the people. Neither justice nor mercy was to be expected ; William and his minister ruled by terror. If any complaint was made the monarch assumed a threatening air and a thundering tone. The Church, too, groaned under grievous oppression ; bishoprics were sold to the highest bidders or left vacant, and the revenues turned to the profit of the royal treasury. St. Anselm, who had succeeded his master, Lanfranc, in the see of Canterbury, was exiled for making just complaints to the king. William speedily received the chastisement of his iniquities. One day while hunting he cried out to one of his knights to shoot a stag that was passing by ; but the arrow, deflected by a tree, struck the king full in the breast, and so delivered England from a tyrant and the Church from a persecutor (1100).

**HENRY I. (1100–1135) ; RECOVERY OF NORMANDY (1106) AND WAR WITH FRANCE.**—Robert, the eldest brother, was still engaged in the crusade when William II. died. Henry, the youngest, surnamed Beauclerc on account of his learning, had himself crowned king of England. The very day of his coronation in Westminster he published a charter, which restored the ancient liberties of the country and guaranteed ecclesiastical immunities. St. Anselm, recalled from exile, blessed the marriage of the new monarch with St. Matilda, who was a daughter

of Malcolm, King of Scotland, and of St. Margaret, a descendant of the Anglo-Saxon kings. This judicious policy won for Henry the affection of his subjects and enabled him to set aside the claims of his brother Robert, who had just returned to Normandy. Robert, vanquished and taken prisoner at Tinchebrai (1106), was shut up in Cardiff Castle, in Wales, where he languished twenty-eight years in the most rigorous captivity. His son, William Cliton, in vain sought the protection of the king of France ; the English monarch, victorious at Brenneville, secured the possession of Normandy. But his triumph was followed by domestic afflictions which clouded the last years of his reign. On his return he sailed from Barfleur, in Normandy. His only son, with other members of the royal family, and one hundred and fifty knights belonging to the flower of the nobility, were to follow him in a vessel called the *White Ship*. But the crew had just been carousing in honor of the young prince, and were unable to manage the craft, which struck upon a rock and went down with all on board. The tidings of this shipwreck threw Henry into a melancholy, so that he was never known to smile again. His daughter Matilda now became the sole object of his affection. After the death of her first husband, the Emperor Henry V., she married Geoffrey, Count of Anjou, surnamed Plantagenet, because a sprig of broom (*plante de genêt*) was the device of his family. The king of England, in order to secure the crown to Matilda, caused the principal barons and members of the royal family to swear fealty to her, but most of them did so only to escape the danger of a refusal. Henry, disappointing the fair hopes which all

entertained at the opening of his reign, had become as merciless and odious a tyrant as his two predecessors.

**STEPHEN OF BLOIS (1135–1154) AND MATILDA ; CIVIL WAR.**—At the death of Henry, his nephew, Stephen of Blois, who had sworn to support Matilda's rights, was the first to ignore them. Being the grandson of William the Conqueror by his mother, Adela, he claimed and seized the crown. All the barons unscrupulously took a new oath of fealty. Stephen at first made them friendly by lavishing favors and money from the royal treasury. When he had nothing more to give, the most powerful refused obedience and treated him as an usurper. David, King of Scotland, proclaiming himself the defender of his cousin Matilda, invaded the northern shires, which he gave up to pillage (1137). The enraged inhabitants marched against him under the leadership of the archbishop of York, and gained the victory of the “Standard,” so-called because they had erected on a four-wheeled chariot a high staff on which were suspended banners of the saints most venerated by the English. But this triumph did not save Stephen's cause. Matilda, landing in England, found partisans sufficiently numerous to dispute his claim to the crown ; so that, in spite of his courage, he was beaten and taken prisoner at Lincoln (1141). But the daughter of Henry I., yielding to her haughty and vindictive disposition, irritated the citizens of London, who drove her from the capital. Stephen recovered his liberty, and England was thenceforth a prey to all the horrors of civil war. “The Normans,” says an Anglo-Saxon chronicler, “entrenched in their castles as in robbers’

dens, sallied forth, pillaging and slaughtering without distinction of age or sex. Nothing was seen but cities, villages, churches, and monasteries in flames ; commerce ceased, and tillage was interrupted in many places. ‘Christ and his saints forget us,’ said the poor people, ‘when so much crime is unpunished.’” At last Stephen, having lost his eldest son, terminated the civil war by acknowledging Matilda’s son Henry as his heir (1153). Naturally good, brave, and generous, he had erred in sacrificing everything to his ambition, which proved disastrous to himself and to England.

HENRY II. (1154–1189) ; EXILE OF ST. THOMAS À BECKET (1164).—On the death of Stephen, Henry, Count of Anjou, the first of the dynasty of Plantagenets, was proclaimed king of England. It has been seen that his marriage with Eleanor of Guienne had rendered him master of nearly all Western France. More powerful than Louis VII., whose vassal he was for his Continental possessions, he wanted to make a display in Paris of his riches and magnificence. His ambassador made a solemn entrance into that city, having a retinue of clerics and knights richly attired, followed by eight chariots laden with the most costly articles of gold and silver. Thomas à Becket, the English ambassador, was the son of a noble Saxon of London, and had earned the friendship of Henry II., who made him preceptor of his eldest son, archdeacon of Canterbury, and chancellor of the realm. To crown so many favors the king wished to elevate his minister to the primacy of England. In vain Becket pleaded his unworthiness and his inability to enter into Henry’s views in regard to ecclesiastical

affairs. "If I become archbishop," said he, "we shall soon cease to be friends." Nevertheless he was named archbishop of Canterbury. Scarcely was he consecrated bishop than he banished luxury from his household and would have no other liveries but those of apostolic poverty; beggars and the unfortunate were his favorite guests. Henry II., already displeased with his resignation of the chancellorship, was still more irritated by his energy in defending the rights of the Church. This monarch attempted to restrict the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical tribunals, and to bring all suits, whether of churchmen or laymen, into the royal courts. In the convention of Clarendon he himself asked the bishops if they would not agree to observe the "ancient customs of the realm." To this insidious question Thomas à Becket replied that they would observe the customs, "saving the honor of God and the holy Church." Henry, then assuming a menacing tone, caused the doors of an adjoining apartment to be thrown open, where soldiers under arms were disclosed to view, awaiting but a sign from their master. Becket, at first calm and resolute, at last yielded to the entreaties of those around him; he promised to observe all the customs, and asked in what they consisted. The next morning the sixteen "Constitutions of Clarendon" were laid before the council; they gave the monarch the right of arraigning clerics before secular tribunals, of administering vacant dioceses and of using their revenues, of naming bishops and of forbidding them to travel beyond the realm, and of accepting or rejecting at will every sentence of excommunication. These alleged customs were, in fact, but innovations devised by Henry II.

to destroy the ancient immunities of the Church. Hence the archbishop of Canterbury declined to follow the example of the other prelates, but, instead of retracting his promise to sign, he asked a delay. On his return to Canterbury he bewailed his own weakness, informed Pope Alexander III. of all that had occurred, begged absolution, and interdicted himself meanwhile from every exercise of episcopal functions. Henry II., beside himself with rage, swore vengeance. "Either I shall be king no longer," he exclaimed, "or this man ceases to be archbishop." Summoned to Northampton, Becket set out, crucifix in hand, after celebrating the Mass of St. Stephen the Protomartyr. Neither menaces nor outrages could shake his resolution. Sentenced to prison as a traitor and perjurer, he appealed to the sovereign pontiff, and succeeded in secretly embarking for France, where he arrived under circumstances very different from those of his former visit as ambassador of King Henry II.

MARTYRDOM OF ST. THOMAS À BECKET (1170).—The exile of the holy archbishop exasperated his cruel persecutor. Henry, after confiscating the possessions of the primate, banished all such as were attached to him by kindred or friendship. The proscribed, to the number of four hundred, were required to swear that as soon as they landed in France they would present themselves before Thomas à Becket. The sight of his unfortunate friends wrung the heart of the exiled prelate, but did not daunt his courage. King Louis VII., in defiance of the threats of Henry, offered a generous hospitality to these victims. And at this very time he was entertaining Pope Alexander III., who had

been driven from Rome by the violence of Frederick Barbarossa. The sovereign pontiff sanctioned the resistance of Thomas à Becket and condemned the Constitutions of Clarendon. Henry II., who feared that his realms might be laid under interdict, consented to accept the mediation of the king of France. In a formal interview he feigned reconciliation with the archbishop, who returned to his diocese amidst the acclamations of all the people, who hastened to meet him. "I return," said he to them, "to die in your midst."

The primate, at the suggestion of the sovereign pontiff, excommunicated several bishops who had openly violated the ecclesiastical laws. Henry II. took up their defence and set no bounds to his fury. One day at table, in a paroxysm of rage, he exclaimed : "Of all the cowards in my service, is there not one that will rid me of this turbulent priest?" Four knights immediately set out ; they found the prelate in the choir of his cathedral, where vespers were just beginning. "Where is the traitor?" they cried ; no one answering, they asked : "Where is the archbishop?" "Here is the archbishop," he replied, "but no traitor. What do you seek in the house of God?" "Your life," they cried with one voice. "And gladly do I give it," was his answer. "I commend my soul to God and Our Lady ; only in his name I charge you that you lay not your hands upon any of my followers." Then one of the wretches struck him on the head. He wiped away the blood as it streamed down his face, and said : "Lord, into thy hand I commend my spirit." They redoubled their blows and left him stretched dead at the foot of the altar (December 29, 1170).

IRELAND BEFORE AND AFTER THE ANGLO-NORMAN INVASION (1171).—Ireland was known to the ancients by different names—Ierne, Iuverna, Hibernia; by the natives it was called Eire (Erin). According to tradition it was peopled successively by the Neimhidians, Fomorians, Fir-bolgs, Tuatha Dé Dananns, and the Milesians, said to have been of Scythian origin. The Fir-bolgs were evidently allied to some of the British Celts. The ancient chronicles narrate the wonderful journeyings of the Milesians, or Scots, whose leader, Milidh, was married to Scota, a daughter of the king of Egypt. Setting out from the Red Sea, they dwelt for a time in Spain. From them Erin was often called Scotia, or Scotia Major, while its colony of Ar-gael (Argyle), at the north of Britain, was known as Scotia Minor, Scotland.

The best known of the many early heroes whose adventures are still related in the Gaelic tongue in Ireland and the Highlands of Scotland was Fion Mac Cumhaill (MacCoole), who disciplined an order of knighthood called the Fenians. He was a lover of music, too, and wrote odes which are still recited. He was the father of Oisin (pronounced osh'in), the most celebrated of the Celtic poets. Nial "of the Nine Hostages" (about 380) invaded Britain and Gaul. His successor, Dathi, was killed by lightning in one of the passes of the Alps, and his body was brought back to Erin for burial.

The people were divided into septs, or clans (*clanna*, children), and each clan held its territory in common. At the death of a clansman his land reverted to the clan, while his personal effects were divided between his sons. Over each clan was a chief, or *clanfinne*. A successor, or *tanist*, was chosen before the chief's

death, usually, but not always, from the chief's family. War was the almost constant occupation of these chiefs, who kept minstrels or bards to sing their exploits and the heroic deeds of their ancestors. There was but little commerce, and cattle was the medium of exchange.

The religion was similar to that of the Gauls and the Britons, and was ministered by a body of men known as druids (*duir*, oak), who paid particular reverence to the oak and the black-thorn, and wore wreaths of oak-leaves when performing their rites. The god Bel was worshipped with solemnity, especially on May-day (*Beltinne*, or *Beltain*), when great fires were lit in his honor.

The island was divided into five kingdoms, Ulster, Leinster, Munster, Connaught, and Meath. Each was ruled by a king, or *righ* (pronounced ree), and one of them, who resided in Meath and was called the high-king, or *ard-righ*, enjoyed a nominal supremacy. The laws were administered by the *brehons*, or judges, and these, as well as the bards and the druids, formed a privileged order.

Early in the fifth century Christianity had been introduced, but seems to have had little success before the arrival of St. Patrick (432). The great saint, before his death (March 17, 465), made all Ireland Christian. Churches and monasteries arose upon all sides, and learning was cultivated as well as religion. St. Brigid, who died at an advanced age (February 1, 525), was abbess of Kildare. St. Columbkille established a great abbey and school at Iona, and was the apostle of Scotland. As stated elsewhere, Irish saints and scholars founded religious houses and great seats of learning on the Continent.

Eric of Auxerre wrote to Charles the Bald : " What shall I say of Ireland, which, scorning the perils of the deep, migrates to our shores with her whole train of philosophers ? " St. Brendan is said to have made a seven years' voyage to the West, and from his descriptions seems to have landed in North America and to have seen the Ohio River. Rhyme in verse was probably an invention of the Irish at this time, as stated by Zeuss, the learned German writer on the Celtic languages.

Erin fell a prey to the Danes (about 748), known as Ostmen, or Eastern men, who for over two centuries carried their ravages to almost all parts of the island. They made settlements at the mouths of the principal rivers, and Dublin, Waterford, Limerick, became their strongholds. But a deliverer appeared in Malachi, the ard-righ, who, rallying the dispirited Irish, put the Danes to rout at Tara. Brian Boru (the Brave), righ of Munster, made an alliance with the Danes, and by their help defeated Malachi and took a part of his territory (1002). Brian became ard-righ, but did not win peace with his glory. His late allies were determined to be masters of the country. The Ostmen summoned their kinsmen from Scandinavia and the adjacent islands for an united effort against Erin. The contending forces met at Clontarf (Good Friday, 1014), where a bloody contest took place. The Danes were utterly routed and their power broken by the warlike Brian, who was now eighty-three years old. But after the battle the white-haired hero was slain in his tent by a Dane who was retreating from the battle-field.

Peace now established, the arts of civilization began to revive. But green Erin was as attractive to

the Christian Anglo-Normans as it had been to their pagan kinsmen, the Danes. On the representations of the learned John of Salisbury, Pope Adrian IV. is said to have issued a bull permitting Henry II. to make conquest of Ireland in the interests of religion and the Holy See, just as another bull had authorized William's descent upon England. The authenticity of Adrian's bull has been questioned, and its genuineness is doubted by able scholars. For some time Ireland was unmolested, as Henry was busy with his own affairs. However, the dissensions of the Irish themselves soon furnished an opportunity of establishing the Norman dominion. Diarmid MacMurroch, King of Leinster, carried off Dervorgil, the wife of O'Ruarc, chief of Brefny. This was the beginning of a bitter war that ended in MacMurroch's flight. The fugitive presented himself to King Henry and did homage for his kingdom of Leinster. A band of Anglo-Norman knights, headed by Richard de Clare, Earl of Pembroke, better known as Strongbow, and including Robert Fitzstephen and Maurice Fitzgerald, landed in Ireland to maintain MacMurroch's cause. Wexford, Waterford, and Dublin fell into their hands. The Danes of Dublin, under Asculf, revolted, but were easily quelled. The Irish, under their ard-righ, Ruari O'Conor, laid siege to Dublin, but were repulsed with great slaughter, and O'Ruarc, who repeated the attempt, was equally unsuccessful. The Irish, looking upon it as cowardly to wear defensive armor, were usually at the mercy of the mail-clad Normans. In the meantime MacMurroch had died, so that Strongbow, having been made tanist, and marrying that chief's daughter Eva, became righ, or king, of Leinster. But Henry

was growing jealous of Strongbow's success and commanded all his subjects to return at once to England. Strongbow hastened to court, surrendered all of his conquests, and received them back as tenant-in-chief.

Henry was so pleased with his new acquisition that he assembled a considerable army and landed at Waterford (October 18, 1171). After five months in Ireland other matters compelled him to leave the country in charge of De Lacy, whom he appointed governor-general. The Anglo-Normans met heroic resistance. De Courcy overran Ulster, but in the south and west the Irish were generally successful. MacCarthy of Desmond broke the strong defences of Cork; O'Brian of Thomond repulsed De Burgo, the lord-deputy at Thurles, and affairs began to look unpromising for the invaders, when the Irish, in the midst of their successes, turned their arms against one another. MacCarthy called upon the Normans for aid against O'Brian, and his example was followed by other Irish chiefs. A period of uninterrupted war set in, and the inhabitants were plunged in such misery that in Edward II.'s time they petitioned for the enjoyment of English laws. But this was opposed by the ten or twelve great Norman families and their retainers, who had parcelled out a good portion of the country amongst themselves, and had erected strong castles to keep the "Irish enemies" in subjection. The Normans pursued the same unrelenting policy of extermination and confiscation that had made them masters of England.

The victory of the Scots over the English at Bannockburn renewed the hopes of the Irish Celts, and Edward Bruce, the brother of the Scottish king,

landed at Carrickfergus with six thousand men (May 16, 1315). Donal O'Nial, out of love for his country, resigning his rights as head of the royal clan, Edward Bruce was crowned king of Ireland. In the meantime the united Gaels had met and routed De Burgo, Earl of Ulster, and Butler, the lord-justiciary. Robert Bruce, King of Scotland, now arrived, so that the Gaels mustered twenty thousand fighting men. But the Normans of "the Pale," as the territory held by the English was called, reconciled their differences, and Felim O'Conor, righ of Connaught, was disastrously defeated at Athenry (August 10, 1316), while Butler sent the heads of eight hundred O'Mores to Dublin as evidence of his victory over that clan. Robert Bruce returned to Scotland, and after the death of his brother Edward the struggle was continued with varying results.

The descendants of the Anglo-Norman invaders, while maintaining themselves as a distinct race, gradually adopted the language, customs, dress, and even the clan-system of the Gaelic Irish, and soon began to forget their allegiance to England. To remedy this the famous Statute of Kilkenny was enacted (1367). It forbade the people of English race to intermarry with the Irish, to have recourse to the Brehon law, to speak the Gaelic language, to wear the Irish dress, or even the beard which was then held as the distinctive mark of an Irishman, to recognize the customs and rights of fostering and gossipred, or to adopt the Irish form of surnames. And this statute indicates the spirit of much of the English legislation for Ireland from that day to this.

STRUGGLE OF HENRY II. WITH HIS SONS AND WITH THE KING OF FRANCE.—Henry II., who had been obliged to war against his own children during the exile of St. Thomas à Becket, feared that the murder of the primate would afford them a pretext to resume arms with the support of the king of France. For the purpose of warding off this danger and appeasing the public indignation, he accepted all the conditions imposed by the legates of Pope Alexander III. Having attested on oath that he had no part in the death of the archbishop, he abolished the Constitutions of Clarendon, and even declared himself a vassal of the Holy See. This tardy reparation failed to dissolve the powerful league organized against him. While his children, upheld by Louis VII., raised the standard of revolt in his Continental possessions, the Scots invaded his realm of England. The monarch at last thought to move Heaven in his favor by a penitential pilgrimage to Canterbury. Clad in a penitent's habit, he made the journey barefoot to the cathedral, where he prostrated himself before the tomb of Thomas à Becket, recently enrolled among the martyrs, and in this position remained for a long while ; then, accusing himself publicly of the words he had uttered at table in a transport of anger, he begged to be scourged by the bystanders (1174). This exemplary penance was immediately followed by such prosperous events that contemporaries regarded them as the effect of divine mercy. The king of Scotland, defeated and taken prisoner, recovered his liberty only on condition of acknowledging the suzerainty of the crown of England. Henry II. landed on the Continent, and forced the king of France to raise the siege of Rouen, and his rebel children to sue for for-

giveness (1174). Still, the young princes, incited by their mother, Eleanor of Guienne, soon resumed their arms. The eldest, Henry, suddenly stricken with a mortal illness, died on ashes, bitterly regretting that he could not receive the paternal blessing. The third, Geoffrey, Count of Brittany, was trampled to death by horses in a tournament given in his honor at the French court. These terrible examples were ineffectual; Henry II. had the grief of seeing his second son, Richard Cœur de Lion, once more unfurl the standard of revolt. The issue was most humiliating to the aged monarch, who had no alternative but to submit to the conditions dictated by Philip Augustus. When he saw at the head of the list containing the names of the rebels that of John Lackland, his youngest son, whom he had always tenderly loved, he was pierced with acute anguish which soon brought him to the gates of death. “Cursed be the day of my birth,” cried he, “and the sons I leave behind me!” Thus died at Chinon the sovereign at one time held to be the most powerful of Europe, and who afterwards seemed the most deserving of pity; for, after shedding the blood of the innocent, he became unfortunate as father, husband, and king.

RICHARD CŒUR DE LION (1189–1199); RIVALRY WITH PHILIP AUGUSTUS.—Richard Cœur de Lion inherited all his father’s dominions; his brother John was surnamed Lackland because he had no appanage but the government of Ireland, of which he was the first viceroy, but had little or no control. Richard, to meet the costs of the Crusade, levied new taxes on his subjects and sold his right of suzerainty over Scotland. We have seen that his brilliant ex-

ploits in the East were followed by rigorous captivity in the Tyrol. Philip Augustus, whom he had offended during the third Crusade, took advantage of his absence to attack Normandy. Ambition had prompted John Lackland to make common cause with the king of France ; but he had no sooner been apprised of the return of his brother than he ordered the massacre of three hundred French knights during a banquet. At such a price did this cruel and perfidious prince expect pardon. Richard, having granted it, made war against Philip until peace was declared through the mediation of Innocent III. (1199). The hero of the Crusade perished ignobly that year in a quarrel about money. One of his barons, of Limousin, having discovered a treasure, was unwilling to surrender more than a half. Richard claimed the whole and laid siege to the castle of Chalus. As he rode to survey it an arrow pierced his shoulder. The wound proved mortal. Before dying he received the sacraments with piety and contrition, and directed that his heart should be deposited in the loyal city of Rouen, and his body laid at the feet of his father.

**JOHN LACKLAND (1199–1216) ; RIVALRY WITH PHILIP AUGUSTUS AND DISPUTES WITH THE HOLY SEE.**—John Lackland, asserting that his brother had bequeathed all his inheritance to him, hastened to secure its possession. But his nephew, Arthur of Brittany, whose rights were incontestable, resolved to enforce them by arms with the support of the king of France. The young prince was attacked unawares and made prisoner in Poitou. John Lackland carried his barbarity so far as to murder him with his own hand. The crafty Philip Augustus

cited John before the court of peers. John refused to appear, and passively allowed the French troops to occupy Normandy, Maine, Anjou, Touraine, and Poitou, upon which the French king had long set his greedy eyes.

As if he were not already hated and scorned enough by his subjects, John completed his dishonor by a religious persecution. As he had destined the primatial see of Canterbury for a favorite, he refused to admit Stephen Langton, an Englishman, whose canonical election had been sanctioned by Pope Innocent III. (1207). Being resolved, he said, to oppose him till death, he already threatened to break with the Holy See. The clergy of Canterbury were stripped of their possessions and sent into exile. The intrepid Innocent III., failing to effect anything by mildness, laid the realms of the royal persecutor under an interdict ; by it all the offices of religion, the administration of the sacraments, were suspended, except that infants were baptized and the Viaticum was given to the dying (1208). John Lackland, far from sharing the consternation of his subjects, gave way to senseless fury ; he caused many priests to be sent to death or to prison, and threatened to cast the others into the sea. Overtaken by a sentence of excommunication (1209), he went so far as to seek alliance with the Albigenses, and even with the king of Morocco, promising the latter to become a Mussulman. This proceeding put him under the ban of Christendom. Innocent III., notwithstanding his reluctance, finally put forth his whole authority. Conformably to the received right of the Middle Ages, at that time acknowledged by all sovereigns, he declared John deposed and his sub-

jects released from their oath of fealty (1212). Philip Augustus, King of France, joyfully undertook the execution of the sentence, which was committed to him and was much to his own advantage. He collected a considerable fleet and army on the coasts of the British Channel. John at last yielded to the dread of this new danger. After accepting Stephen Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury he solemnly swore to repair the evil he had done ; he even declared himself a vassal of the Holy See (1213). Scarcely was he reconciled with the Church than he formed a league to avenge himself on Philip Augustus ; but the defeat of his allies at Bouvines, and afterwards of himself near Angers, blasted all his hopes (1214).

MAGNA CHARTA (1215).—John Lackland, despised by his subjects for his cowardice in the wars with France, and still more hated for his tyranny and rapacity, returned to his kingdom only to undergo fresh humiliation. The greater part of the prelates and barons had leagued together for the purpose of restoring the ancient liberties of the country. The king, on their demand, promised to enforce the charter which Henry I. had published at his accession. This promise was soon retracted. The barons, who had already taken their measures, assembled to enter London by force of arms. As they asserted their liberties in the name of religion, they styled themselves the “Army of God and of his Holy Church.” John, driven from his capital, came to terms, and signed the Great Charter, or Magna Charta, in a meadow on the Thames, between Windsor and London, called Runnymede (June 15, 1215). This charter is looked upon as the basis of the Eng-

lish Constitution. The following is a brief summary of its most important articles: The Church was to be free and to enjoy her liberty of election. The king was to relinquish the greater part of his feudal rights and to levy no tax without the consent of the great national council. No freeman was to be arrested, outlawed, or "destroyed," save by the judgment of his peers. Cities and boroughs were to preserve their privileges, etc.

John's power was greatly limited by *Magna Charta*, and by deceitful means he got Innocent III.'s consent to retract his signature. As he could find no adherents among his subjects, he enlisted bands of foreign mercenaries, who ravaged the length and breadth of the land. The barons offered the crown to Louis, the Dauphin of France, who accordingly entered London in triumph. John, resolving to wage a furious war against him, was crossing an arm of the sea known as the Wash when all his baggage and treasures, including his crown, were swallowed up by the tide. This irreparable loss caused him such vexation that he died three days later, after a disastrous reign of seventeen years.

**HENRY III. (1216–1272); HIS UNPOPULARITY AND THE STATUTES OF OXFORD (1258).**—The eldest son of John, only ten years of age, was proclaimed king of England under the name of Henry III. Louis the Lion, abandoned by the English barons, who looked upon him as a stranger, soon learned that his army had been defeated at Lincoln and his fleet destroyed within view of Dover. In place of longer disputing the crown he was glad to receive a round sum to pay his debts and to be able to get back to France in safety. The earl of Pembroke,

marshal of England, had been named regent of the realm and guardian of the young Henry III. ; he ruled with wisdom, and was succeeded by Hubert de Burgo, the gallant defender of Dover Castle. Hubert, hearing that the French fleet had put to sea on its return to France, in spite of the unwillingness of his lieutenants gave chase with only forty small vessels, about one-third the number of the French ships. It was the first naval engagement between France and England on the open sea, and resulted in a decisive victory for the invincible De Burgo. Only fifteen out of more than a hundred French ships escaped. Henry III. finally assumed the reins of government (1234); but he let himself be influenced by the Frenchmen who had accompanied his queen, Eleanor of Provence, to England. The imposition of arbitrary taxes, the shameful defeats of Taillebourg and Saintes (1242), and the frequent violation of the most important articles of Magna Charta completed the discredit of the English king. A failure of the crops, followed by a famine which he failed to provide for, excited general discontent. Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, a son of the conqueror of the Albigenses and married to Henry's sister, was the greatest man of his day in England. Taking advantage of the dissatisfied feeling of the country, he urged the barons to combine for the liberties of the country, and Henry was forced to convoke a national council at Oxford. There the king swore to observe Magna Charta, and to allow the formation of a committee of twenty-four members, twelve of whom were named by the barons. This committee drew up what is called the Statutes of Oxford. The royal authority was almost merged in

the national council, or Parliament, which was to assemble at least once every three years. The committee of twenty-four, acting in the name of parliament, was to make all the important nominations, to provide for the defence of strongholds, and its orders were to be binding throughout the kingdom under penalty of death. These extraordinary demands won for the council of Oxford the name of the Mad Parliament. Henry III., having recovered a portion of his authority, chose the king of France as umpire. St. Louis, after mature deliberation, decided that the prerogatives of the English crown should be restored as they were before the parliament of Oxford ; that Henry should grant a general amnesty and the full enjoyment of the liberties guaranteed by the Magna Charta of King John.

SIMON DE MONTFORT AND PRINCE EDWARD ; BATTLE OF LEWES (1264) AND OF EVESHAM (1265).—The decision of St. Louis, wise and conciliatory as it was, did not satisfy the boundless ambition of the earl of Leicester. Resolved to maintain the Statutes of Oxford, which were his work, he stirred up another revolt of the barons. Henry III., at the head of the royal army, attacked the barons at Lewes. His eldest son, Prince Edward, who commanded the vanguard, put the London troops to flight, but rashly pursued them too far. Henry III., his brother Richard of Cornwall, the titular emperor of Germany, and Prince Edward himself fell into the hands of the enemy. Simon de Montfort at once became the ruler of England. Coercing the weak Henry, he governed in his name with absolute authority. In 1265 he summoned to Parliament two knights from each shire, or county, and two bur-

gesses from every city and borough of the country. This was the origin of the “lower house,” or House of Commons.

But Simon soon aroused the envy and the misgivings of the people and of most of the barons by his haughtiness, if not by his tyranny. Prince Edward, escaped from prison, soon gathered a fresh army. Simon de Montfort met him near Evesham. He put his aged prisoner, King Henry, in the front rank. Henry, covered with armor that prevented his being known, was wounded in the shoulder and fell from his horse ; he was about to be despatched when he cried out : “ Hold, fellow ! I am Harry of Winchester.” Edward recognized his father’s voice, and, springing to his side, rescued him and bore him to a place of safety. Thanks to his ability and courage, he gained a decisive victory. Simon de Montfort, two of his sons, and all but ten of the rebel barons lost their lives. Henry III. was restored to the full exercise of his authority. Edward, having secured peace to England, took part in the Crusade of St. Louis under the walls of Tunis. His brilliant exploits had made him renowned in the East, but he returned to Europe to receive his father’s last sigh. He was too late, however ; on arriving at Messina he heard of Henry’s death. These tidings made him almost indifferent to the loss of his child while on his journey. As Charles of Anjou expressed surprise at this, “ God,” replied Edward, “ may give us other children ; a good father he gives us but once.”

## CHAPTER V.

## THE SCANDINAVIANS, SLAVS, AND MONGOLS.

The Scandinavians, on the confines of the Christian world, are gradually civilized through their intercourse with Rome ; but the Slavs, seeming to prefer barbarism, retrograde in civilization and deserve the chastisements which the Mongols inflict upon them. In chastising the Eastern races the Mongols open Asia to commerce, science, and Christianity.

## Sec. 1. Scandinavian Kingdoms.

A GLANCE AT SCANDINAVIA.—The three Scandinavian kingdoms, that had embraced Christianity in the preceding epoch, continued to advance in civilization, to form political communities, and to show in a brilliant manner that they had become part of the great Christian family. In the twelfth century the most northern kingdom comprised not only the rugged, barren coast now called Norway but also the country east of the mountains. Its vessels secured it the kingdom of the isles (the Orkneys, the Hebrides, and the Isle of Man), with the colonies of Iceland as well as Greenland, and Vinland in North America. Denmark was not limited to its fertile archipelago ; it held also all the south of the Scandinavian peninsula, then called Scania, and here was Lund, its ecclesiastical metropolis ; moreover, on the continent it possessed the peninsula of Jutland and the rich provinces of Slesvig and Holstein, which brought it into immediate contact with the great Romano-Germanic empire and with the Slavic tribes over whom it was to extend its conquests. Sweden at that time was limited to the lake region of Scandinavia, where is now the city of Stockholm.

NORWAY; INTERNAL COMMOTIONS, EXPEDITIONS.—Of all the Scandinavians, the Norwegians were the last to hear the preaching of the faith in their land ; they were the first to embrace it fully, the first to arm themselves in its defence and to sing the exploits of the intrepid champions of Christ. “Forward ! men of Christ, soldiers of the cross and of the king !” Such was the battle-cry of St. Olaf, the king ; such was his successors’ battle-cry or song of victory ; this was the topic of many a *saga*, or heroic poem, sung by the skalds. In distant Iceland, thoroughly imbued with Christianity, the *eddas*, or poetical traditions of the ancient Scandinavians, and most of the sagas, were compiled in the native Norse tongue. These sagas, which were often very life-like in their descriptions, recited lofty deeds calculated to rouse the courage of the Norwegians by immortalizing their forefathers. Christian law laid hold of the hearts of these vigorous Northmen, and, first turning them into Christian warriors, afterwards tamed and softened them.

Most of the Norwegian kings were possessed of a passion for war. For two or three peaceful princes there were seven or eight that were warlike and eager to brave any danger, as Magnus III. (1093–1103), who, having effected the conquest of the kingdom of the isles, undertook the reduction of Ireland, where he met with utter defeat and was slain at Downpatrick (1103) ; his son, Sigurd I. (1103–1131), married a daughter of Murroch O’Brian, King of Munster in Ireland. He was fascinated by the tales of adventure related of the first Crusade, and set out from Bergen (1107) with sixty vessels carrying ten thousand tried warriors. While on the

way they defeated and despoiled the Mussulmans of Lisbon, of Algarve, and of the Balearic Isles. Arrived in the Holy Land, he was received with enthusiasm by Baldwin, whom he assisted to take Sidon, to deliver Acre, and to open the siege of Tyre. Sigurd and his men, having finished their pious pilgrimage at the tomb of our Saviour, was presented by the king with a piece of the true cross. With this treasure he returned homeward by the way of Constantinople, Hungary, and Germany, but left his fleet and his warriors at the service of the Eastern Christians. The name of the pilgrim Sigurd long resounded among the coasts and fiords of the Northern seas. During the fifty years following the death of this hero Norway was in a state bordering on anarchy. On one hand was the aristocratic faction of the Baglers; on the other the Birkibeins, who were backed by King Sverrer (1178–1202). This prince overcame his opponents, among them the archbishop of Drontheim, paying no heed to the fulminations of Innocent III., whom he succeeded in mollifying. Feeling his end approach, he had himself placed upon his throne to die, as he had lived, a king. His grandson, Haco V. (1217–1263), is considered the greatest king of Norway. During his long reign he crushed the factions, enriched his subjects by commerce, and built a powerful fleet. As he had taken the cross, St. Louis wanted him to command the French fleet in the seventh Crusade; but Haco preferred ravaging Scotland, where he died. The ardor for the holy wars cooled among the Norwegian kings, and their dynasty became extinct in 1319.

**OBSURITY OF SWEDEN; ST. ERIC (1155–1161).**  
—Sweden, destined to take a brilliant part in histo-

ry, was at this time involved in domestic wars, so that for a long while it remained powerless and almost unknown. Christianity had been introduced with very great difficulty into the north of the kingdom, or Sweden proper, under the dynasties of Lodbrog and Stenkil; the southern province, or Gothia, had been more docile. These two divisions of the petty kingdom in no wise resembled one another; but, wishing to remain united, for upwards of a century they agreed in electing kings alternately (1133–1250). Sverker, the first king, elected by the Goths, organized the Swedish Church in concert with the cardinal legate, Nicholas Breakspere, afterwards Adrian IV. The second king, elected by the Swedes, was St. Eric IX., to whom the Swedes proudly attribute their code entitled, “Laws of God and of St. Eric.” Not less brave than just, humane, and generous, he made war against the pagan Finns, who incessantly harassed his kingdom. Surveying the battle-field after a decisive victory, he wept at the sight of so many unfortunates slain without baptism. To ensure his conquests in Finland, and to assist the spread of the Gospel there, he founded the city of Abo.

His successor, Charles, a son of Sverker, founded the archbishopric of Upsal, and left the throne to Canute, a son of St. Eric. Both these families became extinct with their fourth king. The crown then passed to the intriguing family of Folkung, represented by the young Waldemar, a son of Birger and a descendant of St. Eric by his mother. Birger, for sixteen years regent of the kingdom, consolidated the conquests of St. Eric in Finland, founded Stockholm, constructed roads, and reformed the

tribunals ; daughters, till then deprived of the paternal inheritance, became entitled to half a brother's share. This great administrator died too soon for the good of the kingdom (1266). Waldemar, after many disorders, was dethroned by his brother Magnus, whose reign (1275-1290) was the triumph of royal authority.

DENMARK ; THE TWO WALDEMAR.—Sweyn, a nephew of Canute the Great, after a distracted reign (1047-1074), thought to prevent any future disturbance by ordaining that his sons should succeed him one after the other. In fact, five did thus succeed, but with very different fortune : the eldest was wanting in firmness ; the second, St. Canute IV. (1080-1086), full of energy, fell a victim to his zeal for the welfare of Church and state ; the third, unmoved, saw his subjects dying with famine ; the fourth, Eric, surnamed the Good, was loved by his people and made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem ; the fifth, Niels, or Nicholas, was cowardly and cruel. The Vandals, or wanderers, who were Slavs from the Elbe, after pillaging the country for some time, were driven out by the son of Eric the Good, Canute Laward, who became king of the Vandals. The affection of the Danes for this virtuous prince aroused the jealousy of his uncle Nicholas, who ordered his assassination (1131). Canute was canonized by the Church, and his murder so incensed his brother and nephew, as well as the half-converted people of Vandalia, that they rose in arms against Nicholas, and the troubles lasted till the accession of Waldemar I., a posthumous son of St. Canute. He raised Denmark to the highest degree of prosperity.

Waldemar I. (1157–1181), justly surnamed the Great, began by restoring order. In this he had the help of Eskil, Archbishop of Lund, and the illustrious Absalon, called Axel, Bishop of Roskilde, chancellor of the kingdom. He then marched against the Slavs of Vandalia to avenge his country, his faith, and his hereditary rights. In concert with Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony, he defeated and slew the pagan prince Niclot, and concluded an honorable treaty of peace with his successor, Prebislas. He fell upon the fortified place of Arcona, on the island of Rugen; took it and destroyed its great idol of Swantevit. The capture of Wollin, on the right bank of the Oder, completed the submission of the coast. The Slavs, Obotrites, Wiltzes, and Wends became Christians when they were subjected to Waldemar's sway. He was for a short time the dupe of the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa and his anti-pope; but he speedily acknowledged the authority of Alexander III. It was this pope who canonized Waldemar's father.

Waldemar the Great founded Copenhagen. He drew up the enlightened and Christian laws that form the code of Scania and Zealand. He gladly welcomed the holy Abbot William of Paris, who helped to make science, religious discipline, and all virtues flourish in Denmark. Numbers of the Danish youth went to study in the University of Paris, and returned profoundly learned to their native land. Denmark was but little behind the most civilized nations.

King Waldemar I. left, among other children, Ingelberga, who became the unhappy queen of France (1193); Canute VI., a virtuous prince, whose

reign consolidated his father's conquests ; and Waldemar II., surnamed the Victorious. He compelled the dukes of Mecklenburg and of the two Pomeranias to pay homage ; he made peace between Sweden and Norway ; and he led a successful expedition of a thousand good ships and sixty thousand men against the pagans of Esthonia. He was victorious in this undertaking, and founded the cities of Revel and Narva. The glory won by his celebrated standard, the Danebrog, made it ever afterwards the symbol of bravery.

The fortune of kings is fickle. In 1223 Waldemar was treacherously seized by a vassal, and for three years confined as a prisoner, despite the protests of Pope Honorius III. On being ransomed he lost the suzerainty of the Pomeranias, Mecklenburg, and even of Holstein, and was forced to acknowledge the independence of Hamburg and Lubeck. To fill the measure of his misfortunes he was twice vanquished in pitched battle. Even his children were sources of grief to him : his eldest son, Waldemar, died ; the virtuous Eric VI., who succeeded him, was murdered at the instigation of his brother Abel, who after a reign of two years met a just retribution (June 29, 1252), and his body was thrown into a morass. The last legitimate son of Waldemar II., Christopher I. (1252-1259), ascended the throne instead of Abel's sons. He was humbled by the king of Norway and the regent of Sweden, and persecuted the bishops who excommunicated him, and was at last poisoned. His son, Eric VII., after a troubled minority and an unfortunate reign, was despatched by a blow of a mace (1286).

**Sec. 2. The Slavonian Tribes.**

POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF THE SLAVS.—Along the coasts of the Baltic, from the Danish frontier to the great lakes of Finland, were idolatrous and bloodthirsty hordes of Slavonians, whose conversion from barbarism could be effected only by force of arms. Not one of these tribes formed a state, properly speaking, representative of the northern Slavs. The central Slavs were all Christians, but the Moravians had long been enthralled ; the history of the Czechs of Bohemia, who were governed by dukes for three centuries, and by kings from the time of Ottocar I. (1198–1230), blends with the history of Germany, as the rulers of Bohemia were vassals of the German Empire. Of the southern Slavs, who were also Christians, the Wallachians formed the kingdom of Bulgaria (1186–1391), the Servians gave their princes the title of king, and even emperor (1085–1367), and the Croatians essayed to establish a kingdom of Dalmatia (1052–1088). But all of these people succeeded in freeing themselves from the Byzantine power only to become subject at last to Hungary, or still later to wear the yoke of the Ottoman Turks.

But three Slavonian states merit particular attention : the kingdom of Hungary, whose population is Slavonic, except the one hundred and eight Magyar families constituting the nobility, who are of different origin ; the duchy or kingdom of Poland, wholly Slavonic, and, like Hungary, united to the Roman Church ; Russia, also Slavonic, with a slight mingling of Scandinavians. The Russians acknowledged a political head, the grand duke. Their

spiritual head, was the patriarch of Constantinople, who was diverging with his flock more and more from the centre of unity, the Church of Rome. These three border-lands of Eastern Europe felt the brunt of the Mongolian irruptions as scourges for their political and religious errors, and averted from other European countries the horrors of a fresh invasion.

**ROYAL AUTHORITY DIMINISHED IN HUNGARY ; ANDREW II. AND THE GOLDEN BULL.**—The descendants of Arpad alone enjoyed the privilege of being crowned in Alba Royal with the crown of St. Stephen. This was often a subject of bloody contention, as in the case of Solomon and Geysa I. (1075-1077). The successors of the latter, St. Ladislaus and Colomon, vanquished the Greeks of the Danube, and secured a desirable frontier on the south by subduing the Croatians and proclaiming themselves kings of Dalmatia. They peopled and guarded Transylvania with tribes who had consented to be converted. Geysa settled the same province with German colonists, who enriched the kingdom and guarded the eastern frontier, which was particularly exposed to the barbarous hordes wandering over the steppes of Upper Asia, whence the Magyars themselves had emigrated. After the death of Geysa II. Hungary was rent by the pretensions of several competitors for the throne. Bela III., carefully reared at the court of Constantinople, was successful through the influence of Pope Alexander III.; in return he was devoted to the sovereign pontiffs and was preparing a Crusade when he died, leaving the throne to his eldest son, Emeric. But the youngest, Andrew, Duke of Dalmatia, allied with the duke of

Austria, came at the head of a powerful army to dethrone his brother. The latter was not disconcerted ; alone and unarmed, he penetrated the enemy's camp, entered Andrew's tent, and caused him to be arrested on the spot by his own soldiers and shut up in a castle. Having become king several years after, Andrew II. (1205-1235), who had distinguished himself but little in the fifth Crusade, returned to find his own son Bela in rebellion against him. To strengthen his cause by gaining the magnates, who were then utterly vicious, dastardly, and exacting, Andrew foolishly signed the Golden Bull, wherein he granted the nobles the "inheritance of fiefs, exemption from all military service and from every fine not agreed to by them, and even the right to resist the king by open force in case of violation of the bull." This gave form to anarchy, proclaimed the independence of the Magyar lords, and deprived the peasant of his natural protection, which was the royal authority. Having ascended the throne, Bela IV. paid the penalty of the revolt which had occasioned this impolitic measure. In vain he essayed to raise up fallen royalty ; the magnates resisted and called the duke of Austria to their aid ; while, to add to his embarrassment an invasion of the Mongols occurred at this time.

DIVISIONS IN POLAND.—Boleslaus the Bold (1058-1081), a passionate, cruel, and debauched prince, assumed the title of king without the authorization of his liege lord, the Emperor Henry IV., who was then too busy elsewhere to chastise him. The Polish prince's pride was punished by its own excesses. Enraged at the remonstrances of Stanislaus, the Bishop of Cracow, Boleslaus stabbed him during the

Holy Sacrifice and cut him to pieces. Excommunicated by St. Gregory VII., driven away by the Poles, and tortured with remorse, the princely criminal hid his shame or his repentance in a cloister. His successors were content with the title of duke. They assisted greatly in the conversion of the Pomeranians, Prussians, and other tribes of the Baltic, who were considered as subjects of Poland. Pressed by the Poles on the south, the Danes on the north, the Teutonic Knights and Knights of the Sword in the centre, and by peaceable missionaries, as St. Otho of Bamberg, the apostle of Stettin, these belated pagans ended by becoming catechumens.

Boleslaus III. (1102–1138), Duke of Poland, aided by his vassal, the prince of Pomerania, was proud to become the catechist of his pagan subjects; his reign was fortunate, though he unwisely divided his vast realms among his five sons, reserving for the ablest one the city of Cracow, with a certain supremacy over the others. This division was the cause of the civil wars which ensanguined Poland for sixty-five years (1138–1202) until the death of the ambitious Mieislaus, who survived his brothers. True, during this sad period the youngest son of Boleslaus, Casimir II., the Just, had improved the lot of the peasant, abolished onerous taxes, reformed courts of justice, and by his virtues secured the monarchy to his direct descendants. But his son, Lesko the White, and his grandson, Boleslaus V., had troubled reigns; the first was slain by a rebel vassal (1227), and the second overthrown by the irruption of the Mongols (1241).

RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL SCHISM IN RUSSIA,  
AND CONTINUAL WARS.—The grand duke Yaro-

slaf (1019–1054), son of St. Vladimir, was, like his father, absolute master of the Russian possessions. By his testament he distributed princely, almost sovereign, appanages to each of his five sons. The holder of Kief was alone honored with the title of grand duke, and charged to lead the armies against foreign enemies and to enforce respect for his country; nevertheless, the imprudence of such a provision was fully demonstrated by three hundred years of civil wars, the inefficiency of Russian armies when confronted with the Asiatic hordes, and by the humiliating thraldom in which the Mongolian grand khans held the Russian grand dukes.

Five partitions, corresponding to the number of Yaroslavitch princes, had been just made when there appeared on the river **Don** the ferocious Polovtsi, or Comans, who drank blood and fed on raw meat, and even on the dead bodies of the battle-field; like the Uzbeks, who had preceded them, they were from the steppes of Turkistan. The Uzbeks and other barbarians still roamed, unsubdued, on the plains of the Dnieper and the Dniester. On the Volga the Eastern Bulgarians, who were zealous Mohammedans, proudly maintained their independence. To the west Finns, Livonians, Lithuanians, Prussians, all obstinate pagans, were in a threatening attitude. The Russians, though converted, and at first Catholic, appeared indifferent or powerless in regard to the conversion of the barbarians of their neighborhood. Indeed, they often hindered the apostolate; their married priests were wanting in zeal and learning; their prelates, appointed by the successors of Photius and Cerularius, forbid the Russian princes to give their daughters in marriage to sovereigns who

were of the Roman Church, saying that “the priests of that rite have not good doctrine.” This was to censure Yaroslaf, who had been proud to see his three daughters respectively ascending the thrones of France, Norway, and Hungary. Hence a schismatic clergy severed Russia from the rest of Europe, from civilization, and from Catholic unity at the very time when it most needed the alliance of Christian princes and the support of the Holy See.

The supremacy of the grand dukes of Kief was maintained, at least nominally, for about a century after the death of Yaroslaf, amid incessant civil wars and bloody struggles with the barbarians. From 1157 the city of Kief had a rival, not in Moscow, then recently founded, but in the city of Vladimir. The masters of these two cities each took the title of grand duke or grand prince. Civil wars continuing, several flourishing cities, as Novgorod, set themselves up as republics, and in 1212 monarchy ceased to have even nominal existence. To be sure half a score of independent princes then warred with one another, regardless of the Mongols, who were approaching and had just beaten the Polovtsi (1223). After they had been made the slaves of Jenghis Khan they still continued their senseless feuds.

So many political, moral, and religious errors drew down upon the Slavonian states a signal chastisement; another scourge of God, more terrible than Attila was to overthrow the empires of Upper Asia, to shake the gates of Europe, to chastise the Slavonians.

### Sec. 3. The Mongols and the Empire of Jenghis Khan.

CENTRAL ASIA IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY; JENGHIS KHAN (1163-1227).—The nomad tribes of the yellow or Mongolian race had wandered for centuries on the high, cold, and extensive plateau known as Central Asia. Their love of the pastoral life made them unwilling to build cities or to assume the habits of civilized nations. In one of these tribes, under the tent (*hordo*) of a khan, or chief, named Bahadur was born, about 1163, Temuchin, who was to win the title of Jenghis Khan (great chief), and to slaughter millions of men, ruin and pillage opulent kingdoms, make the earth tremble, and found the largest empire that has ever existed.

At the age of thirteen his father died and left him master of forty thousand families. But a revolt broke out ; he was obliged to flee for his life, and fell into the hands of a neighboring tribe, who set him at liberty on the payment of a small ransom. The aspect of affairs was soon changed. With a daring band, and the alliance of some neighboring khans, Temuchin marches against his rebellious subjects, slays many, and throws the prisoners into eighty caldrons of boiling water. Wonderful to relate, this act of cruelty conciliates his tribe and wins him the homage of the Mongols, who put themselves under his leadership. Several chiefs, among others Ung, Khan of the Kerasites, refuse to submit to his mandates ; they are vanquished, despoiled, and their people pass under his yoke. Leading his followers to the bank of a river, the conqueror fills a cup with water, and, draining it in their presence,

swears that thenceforth he will share with them the bitterness as well as the sweets of life ; they, in return, proclaim him their great chief, Jenghis Khan.

These hitherto wandering tribes were then gathered together near the sources of the Amoor, near the beautiful Lake Baikal. Disdaining the icy plains of the north, Jenghis Kahn turned his eyes towards the south. Four mighty empires shared Central Asia : to the northeast Kin, founded by the Tartars ; to the southeast China proper, then governed by the Sung dynasty ; to the northwest Kara-Kitai, peopled by Oigurs and bordering the Altai Mountains ; finally, Tangut, near the Himalaya Mountains, occupied by a tribe of Turks. The first-named empire had the supremacy over China, which paid it tribute, and over Tangut and the Mongols, whose khans were subordinate to it. Against this empire, whose monarch was his sovereign, Jenghis Khan first led his hordes, thirsting for blood and plunder. For five years he ravaged cities, especially Pekin, which he burnt, with its gorgeous palace of the emperors ; he slaughtered the aged as useless, princes as dangerous, prisoners of war as cowards. "The highest happiness of man," said he to his companions in arms, "is to vanquish his enemies, drive them before him, despoil them, and to see those whom they love weeping, without feeling any pity himself." This ferocious conqueror left one of his commanders to subdue, or rather to ruin, the emperor of the Kin, whilst he himself went nine hundred leagues thence to exact tribute of Tangut, then to lay waste Kara-Kitai, where he met with many Christians, among others a bishop whose aspect inspired him with respect—a sentiment hitherto unknown to

him. These Christians had brought into that country with them the arts, the sacred sciences, and a form of writing whose characters Jenghis Khan adopted for the Mongol language. Had he wished to free and to civilize his nation, he would have stopped here; the Mongols were independent, opulent, and apt to learn.

But his hordes had already reached the summits of the great mountain-chain of Bolor-Tagh, where the central plateau terminates, and whence the eye could see the smiling plains, the blooming cities, and all the riches of a new Asiatic empire. It was Khorasmia, which stretched from the Aral Sea to the Indian Ocean, and from the Caspian Sea to the great Bolor chain. This empire, governed by the haughty Mohammed Koteb-ed-Deen, comprised, besides all Persia, wrested from the Seljukian Turks, a part of the Scythian regions and the countries of India, formerly subject to the Gaznevides ; it was the greatest of the Mohammedan kingdoms. Jenghis Khan proposed to form a treaty of alliance with Mohammed. Repulsed with contempt, the Mongol feigned to have received an order from Heaven through the Christian bishop ; he throws himself upon Khorasmia, marches straight upon Bokhara, takes it, enters the grand mosque on horseback, and dashes the Koran to the ground in contempt (1218). Having pillaged and ruined this city, he sets out for Samarcand, where 100,000 soldiers lay down their arms ; thirty thousand of the inhabitants are put to the sword and thirty thousand reduced to slavery. Khiva, Balkh, with all the other great cities, were ruined ; the country was desolated for a long time, perhaps for ever ; the Khorasmians emigrated to-

wards Syria, the dastardly Mohammed retiring to an island in the Caspian Sea, where he died of vexation (1222).

From the midst of these smoking ruins Jenghis Khan sent two of his lieutenants, with his eldest son, Tushi, against the people of the Caucasus, who resisted for a time, but could not keep back, the torrent. The Mongols attacked the Polovtsi and crushed them. One of the vanquished chiefs arrived in Russia and announced to the assembly of princes at Kief : “They have seized our country ; to-morrow they will seize yours.” In fact, ten deputies from the Mongols soon came to demand an alliance with the Russians. The deputies were massacred, and the armies of the princes and the Polovtsi assembled on the Kalka not far from its confluence with the Dnieper. The Mongols coming up, battle ensued. The allied army was overwhelmed with signal disaster ; thousands of dead strewed the plain ; the prisoners were mercilessly murdered ; the princes were smothered under boards ; the conquerors set their tables for a sumptuous banquet in the midst of the dead (1224).

The Mongols did not cross the Dnieper. Jenghis Khan recalled his hordes to march against the empire of Tangut, which he annihilated. He then returned to die near the place of his birth, where thousands of tents were pitched, forming Karakorum, the capital of that gigantic empire. The body of Jenghis Khan was buried at the foot of a tree on the top of a high mountain (1227).

PARTITION OF THE MONGOL EMPIRE ; DEVASTATION OF RUSSIA ; INVASIONS OF POLAND AND OF HUNGARY.—Following Jenghis Khan’s wishes, his four sons divided his vast empire, although but one

bore the title of grand khan and was chief over the others. Octaï (1227–1242) was elected grand khan at Karakorum ; his share comprised Mongolia and the remote Oriental empires. His brother, Jagataï, inherited the central part of Asia, to which he left his name ; in this empire Timur, also called Tamerlane, was to appear in the following century. The youngest, Tului, governed India and Persia, which were together known as Iran ; the eldest, Tushi, being dead, his son Batu was declared khan of the Kapchak, a name designating countries conquered or to be conquered beyond the Caucasus. Batu, having taken command of an army of 300,000 men, set out at once for the west. He fell upon the Bulgarians of the Volga, took their great city of Briakimov (Bolgary), which disappeared for ever, and put all the inhabitants to the sword. The Russian princes had profited by the retreat of the Mongols only to renew their shameful intestine wars. Batu marched on their principal cities ; Resan, Moscow, Vladimir, Kief were burnt, and all the inhabitants butchered, save monks and nuns. “Russian heads,” says an eye-witness, “fell under the steel of the Tartars like heads of barley under the reaper’s sickle.” Batu then fixed his residence at Sarai, on the Volga, where he rested from his work of destruction (1238).

The grand khan, Octaï, did not approve of his nephew’s inaction. To spur him on he sent a fresh army into the Kapchak, under the command of his son Gaiuk. The army first marched towards Poland ; at Chmielnik it met the Polish troops, beat them, and burnt Cracow. New troops were levied in Poland, but they were cut to pieces at Lieznitz in

Silesia (1241). Poland was in alarm, Boleslaus V. in despair, when tidings were brought that the Mongols had passed into Hungary ; they numbered 500,000. King Bela IV. was awaiting them at the defile of the Sayo ; but he was inefficiently supported by his magnates, held in check by the ambitious duke of Austria, and abandoned by the Comans, whose king the Hungarians had just killed. Bela struggled courageously, nevertheless, but his enemies slew 100,000 of his men and began to ravage Hungary with unparalleled atrocity. Villages were surrounded and burned, with all they contained ; cities were completely pillaged, the inhabitants dragged to the public square ; then the Mongols butchered the men, their sons despatched the children with hammers, while their wives tore the Hungarian women to pieces, and afterwards served up their flesh as a repast for their victorious husbands. This scene of horror lasted two years ; the king fled, the magnates were decimated, and the Emperor Frederick II. was making war on the pope (1243).

Gaiuk, recalled to Karakorum to succeed his father, quitted Hungary, whither the Mongols never more returned. The unhappy country was long in healing her wounds, repeopling her solitudes, sowing her fields, and building her cities and churches ; nevertheless she did effect all this. Poland was not so fortunate ; three times more she was horrified by the sight of the Mongols of the Kapchak crossing her frontiers, and led on, too, by Russians. In vain did brave Lesko the Black, the successor of Boleslaus V., strive for victory at Gaslieza (1280) ; he could not shield his country from their atrocities and from its own weakness. Still, the Mongols had

met with a resistance which won their respect. But of all European countries Russia had most to suffer from these ferocious conquerors. She servilely resigned herself to her fate, without essaying to shake off her galling chains, even when her oppressors became Mohammedans or fell upon one another. The grand duke of Russia was invested with his dignity by the khan of the Golden Horde. To him he paid homage and tribute. Russia, cut off from Europe and the Church, remained subject to the Mongols for two hundred and thirty-five years.

GREAT MONGOL KHANS ; DESTRUCTION OF THE ORDER OF THE ASSASSINS (1256), THE CALIPHATE OF BAGDAD (1258), AND THE SELJUKIAN TURKS (1307).—Octaï, son of Jenghis Khan, was succeeded by his son Gaiuk (1242–1249), after which Mangu (1249–1259) and Koublaï (1259–1294), both sons of Tului, were successively proclaimed great khans ; Iran they left to their brother Hulagu. The latter, by invitation of Caliph Motassem, and by the express order of Mangu, approached the heights which the “Old Man of the Mountain” had covered with fortified castles. In this measure of the Mongol khan all the emirs of Syria assisted. The abominable sect of Assassins had at this time a youthful grand master named Roken-ed-Deen, who was the seventh successor of the infamous Hassan. At the approach of Hulagu Roken-ed-Deen was disconcerted ; he delivered up his castles to the khan and sued for mercy, but in vain. After his death the sectaries, hotly followed up, were either exterminated or forced to bury themselves in deserts and caves (1256).

Two years later Hulagu resolved to put an end to the Mohammedan caliphate, which had long been

shorn of its power but not of its pretensions. He advanced towards Bagdad with his army ; a bloody battle ensued on the Tigris, whose waters, turned aside from their channel, drowned the remnants of the Mussulman army. Motassem surrendered at discretion. The inhabitants of Bagdad were ordered to depart unarmed ; 200,000 were massacred. The caliph was forced to point out his immense treasures, and was then condemned to die. So as not to spill his blood, they wrapped him in carpets and beat him to death with clubs (1258).

Thus ended with the last Abbasside caliph the power which Mohammed had left to his vicars. The caliphate lasted six hundred and twenty-six years ; for five hundred years its seat was at Bagdad, where from the outset it attained a prosperity destined to end in disaster.

Fifty years after the dissolution of the caliphate a successor of Hulagu put an end to the Turkish sultanate of Iconium. The Seljuks had enslaved the caliphs, domineered over Mussulman Asia, and drawn the arms of the Crusaders to the East; they scarcely survived the holy expeditions of the Christian knights, whose avengers were the Mongols.

While in the West the sanguinary Mongols were carrying out the strict orders of a mysterious justice, in the far East the great khan, Kublaï, breaking away from the customs of his predecessors, encouraged agriculture, commerce, and literature. Having become master of Southern China by the taking of Nankin (1279) and the fall of the Sungs, who had reigned there for three centuries, Kublaï founded the twenty-first dynasty of the Celestial Empire, rebuilt Pekin and named it Cambalu, and

there received European travellers with honor, among them the famous Venetian, Marco Polo, who lived seventeen years at his court, and the Franciscans, who founded an archbishopric and a flourishing mission at Cambalu. The empire of Kublaï stretched from the Japan Sea to the Mediterranean and the great lakes of Finland ; its population numbered over five hundred million, and could furnish at least five million soldiers. Fortunately, this gigantic empire found limits in its very magnitude. Kublaï was wise enough to suffer partitions already made to become definitive divisions. National reactions, pretensions of princes, diversity of climate, customs, and religions still further subdivided this unwieldy unity.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE TWO GREAT CENTURIES OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

Through the mighty impulse given by the popes many salutary institutions are established ; new religious orders spring up, which attack error and vice, convert the infidels, and teach theological science. At the same time modern nationalities and languages take shape, Christian art produces its masterpieces, the people erect imperishable monuments.

**Sec. 1. Zenith of the Papacy and the Church; the Religious Orders; Propagation and Vindication of Christianity.**

**ASCEÑDENCY OF THE SPIRITUAL OVER THE TEMPORAL; THE PAPACY.**—The more we study this troubled but interesting epoch the more we perceive

that its most prominent trait is the conflict of faith with the calculations of reason, the tendency of ideas to free themselves from the weight of matter, the assertion of the superiority of the spiritual over the temporal. The result, if not a complete victory, which is impossible here below, was at least the marked ascendancy of moral energy over brute force. It is difficult indeed to find two consecutive centuries in history that offer so many strongly-marked characters, heroic examples, and monuments or institutions so useful, magnificent, and lasting. It was in this period that the Crusades took place, modern states were founded, municipal privileges had their origin, and the liberty of nations was first recognized ; it saw the birth of twenty religious orders devoted to the service of humanity, most of which are still in existence ; then was taught a holy and sublime theology, an enlightened jurisprudence, a secure philosophy ; remarkable literary works were produced, rivers were bridged, commercial relations established ; then arose palaces, and those magnificent cathedrals whose graceful spires reached heavenward, whose walls spoke to all in the simple, artistic language of the early masters, and whose very windows, in the richest of colors, chronicled the glory and the suffering of the Church on earth and the triumph of its saints in heaven. Some writers have applied the title of “Ages of Faith” to the two centuries between the election of Gregory VII. (1073) and the convocation of the Fourteenth General Council by St. Gregory X. (1274), and, in fact, during this period wonderful things were accomplished through faith. Others prefer to style this glorious era the artistic and literary revival. All agree

that in this age the Papacy was at the zenith of its power and the influence of the Holy Church received its highest development.

During the three centuries of persecution the head of the Church was seen but little ; he had slight influence on pagan princes, people, and countries. But after Constantine the full splendor of the Papacy shone at the councils, where it faced heresies and was without appeal in general causes. And this splendor was still greater after Charlemagne, for the Roman pontiff, now a temporal sovereign, often disposed of the coveted crown of the revived Western Empire, and he constantly received the voluntary homage of barbarian kings whose subjects had been converted to the faith by the missionaries from Rome. But later, when kings and emperors meddled with spiritual things or made ill use of their power by oppressing their subjects, the pope faced the despots. He remembered, and the people too reminded him, that he was the supreme pastor of Christians, that he had power to bind and to loose, that he alone could bridle the tyranny of princes, hinder popular seditions, chastise delinquents, and promote the public weal by serving the interests of religion. The pope intrepidly undertook the difficult task, and almost invariably succeeded. Our “Peace Congresses” vainly seek to suppress revolutions and wars, to repress abuses of power and the excesses of liberty, and to secure peace, concord, and happiness to nations—an ideal which the Roman pontiffs almost realized. The pontifical authority was everywhere respected, and the effects of its exercise were wholesome.

We have seen how the popes were the first to move

for the freedom of the Holy See, the episcopate, and the entire Church from the interference of the secular power. We have seen what a lofty, nay, heroic, aim they set for the Christian warriors in the Crusades. At the same time they favored learning, encouraged the arts, and fostered a devotion for the missions and for all other good works. And when a pious institution, originating amongst private individuals, began to bring forth fruit, it was soon honored by the sanction of the sovereign pontiff. Such were the Truce of God, chivalry, the associations for building churches, for constructing bridges, making roads, protecting pilgrims ; such were the universities, and such especially were the religious orders.

ORDERS OF MONKS, OF REGULAR CANONS, AND OF KNIGHTS OR MILITANT MONKS.—During the preceding era the Abbey of Cluny had begun a wholesome change ; instead of isolated, independent monasteries, united only by use of the same rule, houses were founded which continued subject to the mother-house, which was the common centre and the supreme authority. The congregation of Cluny was really the first religious order ; it furnished the model on which new orders were formed. This period witnessed the rise of many, but twenty-two are considered the most remarkable, and eleven of these were founded in France or by Frenchmen.

In 1076 St. Stephen of Thiers built himself a hermitage in Limousin ; hence the origin of the order of Grandmont, whose members were called Good Men on account of their humility. In 1084 St. Bruno of Cologne, theologue of Rheims, was

conducted by St. Hugh, Bishop of Grenoble, into the rugged mountains of Dauphiny, where they founded the Carthusians, who were both anchorites and cenobites, and who have preserved the primitive spirit of their order to our own time. In 1098 St. Robert withdrew to Citeaux, near Dijon, where he might live with greater austerity than was required by the rule of St. Benedict. This austerity, which repulsed others, attracted St. Bernard, a Burgundian nobleman. At twenty-two Bernard became a Cistercian with thirty of his friends, and was soon imitated by his five brothers and his aged father. The renown of this great saint gave the Cistercians the name of Bernardines; they are now commonly known as Trappists. In 1099 Blessed Robert of Abrissel, a Breton missionary, founded two monasteries, one for monks, the other for nuns, at Fontevrault.

To the number of these monastic orders, nearly all grafted on the Benedictine stock, and more or less cut off from the world, the twelfth century added the orders of Regular Canons, who, taking the rule of St. Augustine for a base, bound themselves to the obligations of the cloister while still performing the functions of the sacred ministry. Such was the congregation of St. Victor, founded at Paris in 1105 by the famous professor, William of Champeaux; the ancient abbey of St. Genevieve, which was soon united to St. Victor's, gave the members of this congregation the title of Canons of St. Genevieve. St. Norbert, who had been chaplain of the Emperor Henry V., and who was then eloquently preaching the truths of salvation everywhere in France, by the direction of the pious Bishop

Bartholomew of Laon chose for his settlement a valley since called Prémontré, in the forest of Coucy. In this abbey began the order of Premonstrants, or Premonstratensians, also called White Canons, which still flourishes in Belgium, Austria, France, and the United States.

The eight military religious orders spoken of in the history of the Crusades were also founded in the twelfth century ; of these three were in Palestine, three in Spain, one in Portugal, and one in Livonia. On the battle-field these various militant religious did not differ in bravery, abnegation, or devotion to the cause of Christ ; but in their monasteries the Templars lived under the Benedictine rule of Citeaux, while the Hospitalers and the Teutonic Knights followed the rule of St. Augustine. There were the same differences between the three Spanish orders of Alcantara, Calatrava, and St. James, the first two having adopted the rule of St. Benedict, or of Citeaux, the latter that of the Regular Canons, or of St. Augustine. In Portugal the Cistercian Order of Avisa in course of time was merged in the Knights of Calatrava, while the Knights of the Sword in Livonia disappeared in the similar order of Teutonic Knights.

MENDICANT AND CHARITABLE ORDERS.—The thirteenth century, which began during the illustrious pontificate of Innocent III. (1198–1216), saw the appearance of religious families differing in their aim, their spirit, and their rules, as well as in their external characteristics, from the orders that had preceded. Heretofore the monastery, the regular cloister, or the military post had required the performance of duties which, though not incompatible

with the priesthood and the priestly functions, are at least independent of them, even if they do not sometimes hinder them. And, besides, the monk, required to reside in the monastery, and deprived by vow of the right to own property or to enjoy a revenue, looks to his order, of course, for his sustenance. Hence the order must possess revenues. But now appears a new body of men, mostly priests, whose mission is to seek souls ; they are poor, their convents are poor ; when they go abroad they beg their bread on the way ; after laboring hard they return to their house, confident that their Heavenly Father will take care of them. Such are the mendicant friars, who are divided into the four great orders founded at this epoch.

The first two are, the Order of Preaching Friars, or Dominicans, called also Black Friars and Jacobins, founded at Toulouse by the eloquent and zealous Castilian, St. Dominic de Guzman ; and the Order of Friars Minor, often called Gray Friars because of the color of their habit in England and some other countries. This last order, which has been divided into several branches, was founded by the humble and seraphic St. Francis of Assisi. It includes Capuchins, Observantines, Alcantarines, and Reformed Franciscans. These two illustrious families arose at the same time, for the same end, and through the same inspiration. One day two pilgrims met in a church in Rome ; they had never seen one another before, and yet they embraced, exclaiming : “ You are my brother ! ” They were St. Dominic and St. Francis. The pope, in a mysterious vision, had beheld the two supporting on their shoulders the basilica of St. John Lateran, the

mother and mistress of all churches. In fact, these two holy patriarchs during their lives accomplished prodigies in the service of religion, as their illustrious and prolific posterity have done ever since. Innocent III. approved both orders; his successor, Honorius III., solemnly confirmed them (1217 and 1221). The same pontiffs changed the Carmelite monks into mendicants. In imitation of the prophet Elias they had made their first abode on Mt. Carmel, in Palestine. They are often spoken of in history as White Friars. In 1256 Alexander IV. united into one mendicant order, under the name of Hermits of St. Augustine, or Augustinians, sometimes called Austin Friars, all the religious of the West, who at that time were living separately. It is to be remarked that each of these great orders includes three: a first order for men, a second order for women, and a Third Order, composed of tertiaries, or such as live in the world. But frequently tertiaries are assembled in religious communities. Many of the communities of female religious in the United States are of the Third Order.

After the mendicant orders, who sought only souls, there were formed during the same century orders apparently concerned with the body only. A noble lord founded at Montpellier the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, whose end was to nurse the sick in hospitals; Innocent III. approved it. Urban II. had likewise approved the Hospitalers of St. Anthony, who were established in Dauphiny when the fearful epidemic called the "sacred fire," or St. Anthony's fire, was rife. On the appearance of the leprosy in the West lazar-houses were opened everywhere; there was also founded an association of

clerics and laymen, who shut themselves up for ever in these houses, “and for the love of Jesus Christ braved so nauseating an odor that they may well be ranked among the martyrs.” The Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, in destroying Milan, had ruined a great number of families ; to relieve them the order of the “Humiliated” was instituted, in which the highest nobility bound themselves by vow to manufacture woollen stuffs for clothing the indigent. Many Christians languished in Mohammedan dungeons, where, for want of ransom, they were ill-treated and in danger of losing their faith. St. John of Matha, a doctor of Paris, born in Provence, and St. Felix de Valois, a prince of the blood-royal of the Capetians, founded the Order of the Holy Trinity for the Redemption of Captives, approved by Innocent III. (1198). Robed in their tri-colored habit, the Trinitarians, sometimes called Mathurins, begged an alms at every Christian door ; then they betook themselves to Granada, Morocco, or Tunis to ransom the captives from their chains and bring them back to their native land. If the sum they had brought did not suffice to deliver all the captives, they gave themselves as substitutes for the prisoners, and remained in chains till some one ransomed them. Heroic emulation gave rise to the Order of Our Lady of Mercy, whose end also was to redeem Christian captives. It was founded by St. Peter Nolasco, a rich gentleman of Languedoc. With the assistance of King James I. of Aragon he established it at Barcelona (1223).

Several purely monastic orders also were founded in the thirteenth century. We shall mention only the Paulist monks of Hungary and Portugal ; the

Sylvestrians, founded in 1231 by St. Sylvester of Gazzolini for the strict observance of the rule of St. Benedict in Italy; and the Order of the Servites of Mary, established in 1232, on Monte Senario, by seven pious senators of Florence. This is enough to justify the admiration excited by this period, in which, although no doubt crimes and errors were rife, yet faith accomplished wonders, increased the opportunities for heroism, and brought forth a marvellous variety and number of religious orders.

PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH AMONG THE TRIBES OF THE BALTIc AND IN THE REMOTE EAST.—It cannot be doubted that Christian piety made great progress during a period so prolific of holy institutions. Piety filled the new convents with zealous men and women, preached Christianity to unbelievers, confounded heretics by the lustre of its incomparable science and the splendor of its ceremonial. This period was crowned by the institution of the triumphant feast of the Blessed Sacrament (1264).

At the opening of this epoch there were still some countries of Europe not converted. On the coasts of the Baltic the Slavs (Obotrites, Wiltzes, Pomeranians) kept their gods through hatred of the Germans; the mixed tribes (Prussians, Letts, Lithuanians), half Germans, half Slavs, continued to foster and increase their religious and national antipathy; finally, the Tschudi (Lithuanians, Courlanders, Esthonians, Finns), of a race wholly foreign to the four other races of Europe, practised their gross worship with impunity, doubly protected by the snows of the north and the isolation of their country. Apostolic men, however, had ventured into those infidel lands and had

met with martyrdom. Apostolic heroism did not suffice. It needed the support of another kind of heroism—that of the Scandinavian kings, the dukes of Saxony and Poland, of armies of Crusaders, and above all of the Teutonic Knights, the Knights of the Sword. The work of conversion was effected ; bishoprics, churches, and monasteries were erected there as elsewhere in Europe. At the close of the thirteenth century Lithuania alone resisted Christianity, but completely surrendered in the following century, when it became part of Poland.

From the seventh century Mohammedanism had been an impenetrable barrier against the entrance of Christian missionaries into Central Asia. However, it is certain that the Gospel was preached at an early date in the far East by Nestorians or by Catholics ; but the impossibility of communicating with the central authority of the West left the Eastern Christians without the unfailing test of the purity of their traditional belief. They retained only certain external forms, so that we see with astonishment that bells, monasteries, pilgrimages, litanies, and processions are used in the worship of the modern Buddhists, and that the pomps of the papal court have been imitated, or rather travestied, by the court of the Grand Lama. A prince of Central Asia, supposed to be Ung, Khan of the Kerasites, sent ambassadors to Pope Alexander III. This was in the thirteenth century, and they arrived in Rome after a wonderful journey and a thousand mishaps. Transported with joy, the pope congratulated the prince, whom he called Priest John (Prester John), commended his zeal, and consecrated the chief of his ambassadors bishop (1177). It is not known whether

the embassy succeeded in reaching their far-off country through the Mohammedan districts which intervened. But when later the Mongol conquests had levelled all barriers, the popes, St. Louis, and the Venetians at various times made several attempts to get news from Prester John's empire. Amongst the adventurous travellers, who penetrated by different routes even to Upper Asia, were the Dominican Ascelino and the Franciscans Plan-Carpin, Rubruquis, and John de Montcorvin. Two Venetians, brothers named Polo, visited the court of the great khan or mogul, and the son of one of them, the famous Marco Polo, spent many years in Asia, and has left us a faithful account of his travels. John de Montcorvin filled all hearts with joy by the tidings that he had just baptized six thousand Mongols under the very eyes of Kublai, the Grand Khan, that princes and people were well disposed toward our holy religion, and that a magnificent harvest was ripening at the other end of the world. In fact, a prosperous mission was founded, and it flourished in China during the Mongol dynasty of Yuen, the descendants of Jenghis Khan. But new revolutions in Asia again broke up the relations between the Asiatic Church and Rome; the downfall of the Yuens in 1368, and the distractions occasioned by the great schism of the West, delayed the revival of the missions to China until the sixteenth century.

FANATICAL SECTS; ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INQUISITION.—While the Church in the West reformed her discipline, recovered her liberty, and accomplished wonders, most dangerous enemies were arising in her midst. They sought to undermine her

foundations by assailing her constitution, her doctrines, her worships, her hierarchy, and they heeded no counsels but those of their own dark and fanatical enthusiasm. One of these ranters called himself the Son of God ; he forbid the sacraments and the payment of tithes. Another attacked the Mass, singing, and the use of images. Others, like the Waldenses, Vaudois, or Poor Men of Lyons, as they were variously called, had a horror of the Catholic festivals, the sacred rites, and especially of confession. At their meetings they were entirely occupied in reading the Holy Scriptures. Others, pluming themselves upon the name of *pure*, contended that there were two opposite principles or gods : one the good principle, who permitted all things to his followers, the other the evil one, who ruled the visible world, where everything, religion, sacred edifices, the priesthood, the Church itself, all were sinful. Among the latter were the Albigenses, whose doctrines were derived from the Paulicians and the Manicheans. It is impossible to describe the abominations of these sectaries, or the excesses they were led to commit in their diabolical zeal. Heaven inspired the eloquence of such men as Robert d'Arbrissel, Norbert, and Bernard, who by persuasion, by the example of a life of mortification, and by the evidence of miracles labored to win back these wretches to the faith. The pope and the bishops took an active part in the same work ; and yet these efforts were nearly all unsuccessful, or at least unsatisfactory. The establishment of the mendicant orders and the exemplary lives led by their members made some impression on the heretics, but yet only a few were converted. To prevent them from mur-

dering monks, nuns, and friars, and from burning churches and monasteries, as well as to keep them from overturning civil society itself, nothing was left but to send armies of Crusaders against them. They were forced to yield, and agreed to submit to the laws; but with many this submission was only apparent. Many of them continued to scatter the poison of their doctrines in secret. An essential duty of bishops, and especially of the pope, who is the supreme bishop, is to watch over the purity of doctrine not alone of the clergy but even more of the laity. Every bishopric is therefore, of divine right, a tribunal for trying cases of faith, and such as regard morals or the discipline of the Church. The Roman pontiff, as judge of last resort, has the right to set up extraordinary tribunals, furnished with ampler powers and armed with greater authority than the ordinary episcopal courts. And these tribunals were constituted either subject to, or independent of, the bishop of the diocese. And that is what was done in the thirteenth century under Innocent IV. by the establishment of the Inquisition, or Holy Office. This was an ecclesiastical tribunal where cases of faith were adjudicated, and stubborn or relapsed heretics subjected to the censures of the Church. The Inquisition never gave sentence of death. But as the princes, kings, and emperors of that time, including Frederick II., looked upon heresy, blasphemy, and sacrilege as crimes against civil society, they seized the culprit on his leaving the Inquisition and inflicted the penalty of death. In becoming Christian most of the nations of Europe still retained their old contempt of life, and could not be expected to show much mercy to those whom

they considered as worse than mere enemies. Many of the institutions of the Middle Ages, especially the Inquisition, have been severely criticised in our time, and justly too, perhaps ; but it would be well to remember that the people of the Middle Ages would quite as severely criticise our modern indifference to errors that are fatal to society as well as to religion.

## Sec. 2. Theological Sciences, National Languages, Christian Art.

ORIGIN OF SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY ; ST. ANSELM AND PETER LOMBARD.—God is able to turn the greatest evil into a means of good. Heresies swarmed in the eleventh century, and their followers rushed into every excess. Then appeared men of genius who brought their superior reasoning to the defence of the faith, and who, reverently fathoming our sublime mysteries, cast floods of light upon things hitherto dark to the human intellect.

Bérenger of Tours, Archdeacon of Angers, on the pretext that the traditional doctrine of the real presence of Jesus Christ was misunderstood, undertook to explain it in a singular fashion. The true doctrine was vindicated in the councils and justified in the solid reasoning of the learned writings of such men as Guimond of Aversa, Durand of Troarn, Hugh, Bishop of Langres, and especially their master, Lanfranc, who was an Italian by birth, and the founder of a celebrated school at the Abbey of Bec in Normandy (1055). From this school went out another Italian who succeeded Lanfranc in the abbey, and afterwards in the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury. This was St. Anselm, a doctor of the

Church. The discussions on the august Eucharist led him to the question, "Why a God-Man?" and he wrote a work which bears that title (*Cur Deus Homo*), and still astonishes us by its depth and clearness. Another day, while sounding his thoughts, he discovered his famous demonstration of the existence of God. But the demonstrative value which he attributed to ideas met objections. Roscelin of Compiègne allowed only a nominal bearing to the general concepts of our intellect, whereas Anselm, William of Champeaux, the head of the Paris school, and others maintained that the objects of our ideas are real. Thus the famous dispute between nominalism and realism, which had long before divided the philosophers of Greece, was renewed in the philosophical arena, where it helped to quicken the mighty intellects of mediæval times without preventing their admirable agreement on revealed truths, whose harmonious accords were only the more clearly brought out by the divergence of sounds. At this time were laid the foundations of scholastic theology—that supernatural philosophy which leads our reason to gaze upon revealed truths, to contemplate their beauty, and to recognize their relation to truths of the natural order.

Peter Abelard appeared in the lists. He was a native of Nantes, of an uncommon talent, possessing an extraordinary imagination, quick perception, and ready faculty of retort that made his dialectics the wonder of the day, and drew crowds of hearers, who neglected the other professors of Paris. The scandal which attached to him on account of the famous Héloïse compelled him to withdraw, but his disciples followed him to Melun, Corbeil, and to the monastery

of the Paraclete. All this encouraged his vanity ; in anything but an humble spirit he undertook to explain our greatest mysteries, and in treating of the Holy Trinity especially he fell into errors which St. Bernard, whose pitiless logic was more than a match for the scholar's dialectics, fully exposed. Abelard, after his defeat, retired to Cluny, where he died in peace in the arms of Peter the Venerable (1142). The invincible St. Bernard likewise silenced Gilbert de la Porré, the Bishop of Poitiers, who had been led by nominalism into error regarding the same mystery of the Trinity. Scholastic theologians were forced to be upon their guard against altering dogma while trying to defend it. This difficulty was understood and fully met by Peter Lombard. He was an Italian of obscure birth, the friend of St. Bernard and the disciple of Abelard. His *Four Books of Sentences* (*Liber Sententiarum*) contain the whole substance of theology on a very simple and scientific plan. For more than three centuries that work served as a textbook of theology. Raised to the see of Paris (1159–1164) on account of his merit, the holy and learned “Master of the Sentences” was one day visited by his mother, a poor peasant woman, who had come all the way from Italy to see her son, and had arrayed herself as she thought befitting the mother of so great a dignitary. “There is some mistake,” said he ; “my mother does not wear such fine clothes.”

St. Bernard and his school had preserved scholasticism from dangerous speculation. This austere religious, agreeable writer, and powerful orator was the last of the fathers of the Church. He represented what is called Mystic Theology. According

to him, a theologian should combine superior intellect with great mortification and profound humility ; then would he rise above his fellows as much as heaven is above the earth. The thirteenth century realized this ideal.

THE GOLDEN AGE OF THEOLOGY ; ST. BONAVENTURE (1221-1274), AND ST. THOMAS (1222-1273).—New heresies had sprung up ; proud professors, such as Amaury of Chartres and David of Dinan, in opposing the dualism of the Albigenses, went astray in the treacherous mazes of pantheism. The works of the Mussulman Averroës (1120-1198) and of the Jew Maïmonides (1135-1204) were greatly in vogue south of the Pyrenees. These two scholars were both natives of Cordova, and were both physicians ; one to the Almohade sultan of Morocco, and the other to the Ayubite sultan of Cairo. Sceptics in their own religion, they agreed in their hatred of Christianity, and in a purely rationalistic philosophy, which Maïmonides drew from an allegorical interpretation of Genesis, and Averroës from the works of Aristotle. Averroës wrote a commentary on Aristotle, which for a long while enjoyed great reputation.

Then appeared the mendicant friars. From the very outset they saw the need of opposing science to science, of giving students pure and solid instruction, and of circulating good books. Paris was the home of theological studies ; and thither repaired the English Franciscan Alexander of Hales, and the German Dominican Albertus Magnus, Count of Bollstaedt. They expounded Aristotle and the “Master of the Sentences” as none had ever done before. But, great as was their merit, the lustre of their genius was dimmed, perhaps, by the light

which shone from their illustrious disciples, both Italians. St. Bonaventure was a Franciscan and born in Tuscany, while St. Thomas, of the noble family of the counts of Aquin, was a Dominican, born near Naples. Both uniting consummate holiness of life with brilliant genius, the profundity of the mystic with the sublimity of speculative theology, the Seraphic Doctor, Bonaventure, and the Angelic Doctor, Thomas Aquinas, have continued to our own day the masters of divine science. Closely united in esteem and friendship, they often met at the palace of the good King St. Louis ; they fasted and prayed to understand more clearly what they were afterwards to teach their hearers or transmit to posterity. Bonaventure perforce accepted the government of his order. Thomas was fortunate enough to escape the archbishopric of Naples. He made use of his laborious leisure to compose, among other works, a double synthesis, or *Sum of Theology* ; one (*summa* against the Gentiles) is an apology for Christianity against all unbelievers who are brought to the pale of the Church ; the other (theological *summa*) is an analytical exposition of the whole Christian edifice. This last is a work of colossal proportions and of charming simplicity. At first we see God, one in his nature and three in his person, creating the angels, the world, and man out of nothing ; then man obliged by free and meritorious actions to return to God ; at last God himself, made man, aids man to work out his own salvation. "Thou hast written well of me," said our Lord one day to Thomas. "What reward wouldest thou have ?" "None other than thyself, O Lord," replied the saint. He was on his way to the Oecumenical Council

of Lyons, where he died in the presence of St. Bonaventure. At his canonization by Pope John XXII. no other miracles were required to be proved than the lucid solutions which the Angelic Doctor had given of questions hitherto perplexing.

The Order of St. Dominic also offers at this epoch Vincent of Beauvais, who composed the Great Mirror, a voluminous encyclopædia of the natural, doctrinal, moral, and historical sciences of his time. The Order of St. Francis produced Roger Bacon, the linguist, mathematician, and most astonishing natural philosopher of his century, and Duns Scotus, a theologian whom the entire Franciscan school has gloried in following. Thus through the instrumentality of the mendicants science unmasked, combated, and overcame all errors.

CIVIL AND CANON LAW; UNIVERSITIES.—In the opening years of the twelfth century Irnerius, an erudite Bolognese, exhumed the Pandects, the Institutes, and the Code of Justinian from the dust where they had long lain. He at once began to teach Roman or civil law publicly at Bologna. His commentary is known as *Glossæ*. At first it was certainly not clear what utility there could be in an ancient species of legislation but little fitted to the wants of feudal society. But the German emperors, particularly Henry V. and Frederick Barbarossa, dreamed of universal monarchy, and were glad of the opportunity of reviving the absolutist principles of Cæsarian law. They encouraged its professors, for they knew those professors would in return be ready to support their patron's despotic pretensions. Besides the old Roman law Bologna had learned professors who taught the sacred canons, which were in full force in Chris-

tian society. To further this study Gratian, a Benedictine monk, compiled the *Decretal*, in which were methodically arranged and classified the decisions of popes, councils, and fathers of the Church (1152). Gratian's *Decretal* is greatly esteemed by those learned in canon law. It was desirable, however, that the sovereign pontiff should himself publish a code in his own name; this was done by Gregory IX. in 1234. By his direction the learned Spanish Dominican, St. Raymond of Peñafort, made a collection in five volumes of all the various decisions of the popes down to that time; the pope, who was himself a great canonist, sanctioned the work, which is known as the *Decretals of Gregory IX.* From that epoch canon law and civil law were taught in the universities, and the highest ambition of students was to become doctors of both laws.

The most celebrated universities date from this epoch; the episcopal and abbatial schools could no longer contain the great numbers of students eager for knowledge and for the degrees which were the passports to dignities, given to none but the deserving. The instruction generally bore on the arts, under which were grouped literature, law, medicine, and theology. At the same time certain universities were distinguished for special faculties—as Bologna, Padua, and Toulouse for law; Salerno and Montpellier for medicine; Paris for theology. The oldest and most celebrated was the University of Paris. In Germany great universities arose which soon disputed the honors with the older foundations; amongst them Heidelberg in Baden, Vienna, and the University of Ingolstadt in Bavaria, in our own days transferred to Munich. Oxford and Cambridge

were opened in England, Salamanca in Spain, and Coimbra in Portugal. These and many others were founded in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries under the patronage of the popes, for no university could be constituted without a papal bull.

NATIONAL LITERATURE.—The people of the universities, as was proper, spoke a common language, the Latin, which they were able to bend to all the wants of expression. So that the national idioms which appeared mostly at this epoch were not formed by the universities ; the vernacular tongues found their first literary expression in the chronicles, laws, war-songs, the long poetical compositions destined to enliven the popular festivals or to while away the tedious hours of watch and ward in the baronial castles.

The Russian chronicle of the monk Nestor, the Scandinavian eddas and sagas, the Niebelungenlied and the poetry of the German Minnesingers, the Castilian Romance of the Cid, and the various productions of the French troubadours belong to the twelfth or thirteenth centuries. Two languages prevailed in France. In the south, and especially in Provence, the *langue d'oc* was for a time the chosen language of the minstrels or troubadours, and the best specimens are found in the poetry of Sordello, Bertrand de Born, and Vidal ; but after the twelfth century it ceased to exist as a written language, and was entirely displaced by its rival, originating in the north of France, known as the *langue d'oïl*, the foundation of the modern French tongue. The earliest works of the *langue d'oïl* were the popular sermons of St. Bernard, the great epic compositions of the Anglo-Norman Robert Wace, and the songs and

lyrics of Chrestien of Troyes, Alexandre de Bernay, Huon de Villeneuve, and others.

The epic poetry of this period, called *gestes*, can generally be classed under two heroic cycles—that of Charlemagne and that of the Round Table. From the imagination of the earlier chroniclers a fabulous Charlemagne had been created. Surrounded by his twelve peers, or paladins, the great emperor braved a thousand dangers, vanquished his enemies, and liberated Jerusalem. To this cycle belong the Song of Roland, The Four Sons of Aymon, Ogier the Dane, and many others. The Anglo-Normans found more delight in the cycle of the Round Table, as its stories related principally to ancient Britain, the land of their conquest. Among these stories are The Quest, or Search, for the Holy Graal, The Enchantments of Merlin, The Adventures of Launcelot, and others, which have been popularized in our own day by Tennyson. The Romance of Brutus, which has fifteen thousand verses, is, as it were, the preface, and the Romance of Rou, or Rollo, which is but little shorter, may be looked upon as the epilogue or sequel, of the epic romances of the Round Table. Both were composed in the twelfth century by Robert Wace, canon of Bayeux.

At this epoch, too, dramas were composed for representation in the churches. As their subject was always religious, they were known as mysteries, such as the mystery of the Nativity, of the Kings, of the Passion. This last was the favorite. One of these mystery-plays still in existence is called The Parable of the Virgins. In it our Saviour speaks Latin; the wise virgins, French; and the foolish virgins, Provençal.

CHRISTIAN ART AND GOTHIC CHURCHES.—The great Dante, in his immortal epic, the *Divine Comedy*, has given us the whole theology of the Middle Ages. But other artists had preceded the Christian Homer. Beautiful churches in the Romano-Byzantine style, and magnificent cathedrals in the Gothic, show the rise of an entirely new system of architecture. The whole Christian theology breathes in those august fanes whose foundations are buried deep in the soil, while the cross on their spires seems to reach heaven itself. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries the classic styles of architecture, somewhat modified, as in the Roman basilicas and St. Sophia at Constantinople, were still the only ones recognized by the architects. The lines were extended, proportions enlarged, cupolas more lofty, and as a result we see the great churches of Cluny, of Canterbury, Toulouse, St. Stephen of Caen, St. Remi of Rheims. The semi-circular arch was still preserved, but highly ornamented. Towards the end of the twelfth century, while retaining the dimensions of the sacred edifice, the pointed was substituted for the semi-circular arch; the façade, the windows, the little columns, the ceilings themselves, all seem as if drawn towards heaven, like the prayers and the chants of the faithful. The wonderful masterpieces of Amiens, Salisbury, York, and Westminster Abbey, the Sainte Chapelle at Paris, the minsters of Strassburg and of Freyburg, the church of St. Stephen at Vienna, and the cathedrals of Magdeburg and Cologne, as well as those of Burgos and Toledo in Spain, are all calculated to promote the religious sentiment by their serious beauty. The uniform degree of excellence which these Gothic

edifices attained at the same time in different parts of Europe is explained by the fact that many of the same men were employed in the construction of all. Guilds of stone-masons were formed under the sanction of the Church. They were called Freemasons, and for a long while had the exclusive right to work in the construction of ecclesiastical and public edifices. The finest specimens of Gothic architecture date from the thirteenth century.

Of the other arts, those were especially cultivated which contributed to the embellishment of churches—casting in bronze, for instance, and painting on glass, which was invented in the eleventh century, and had now attained great perfection. Sculpture and painting became independent arts in the thirteenth century. From the study of classic models Niccolo da Pisa, in the beginning of that century, revived sculpture, while about the same time Cimabue, a Florentine, taught by Greeks, caused painting to flourish once more.

## FIFTH EPOCH (1270-1453).

*FROM THE DEATH OF ST. LOUIS TO THE TAKING OF CONSTANTINOPLE—183 YEARS.*

Religious and political anarchy characterizes the last epoch of the Middle Ages. Pontifical authority is no longer able to exercise its beneficent influence over the nations of Christendom. Hence result disorders and scandals in the Church, a hundred years' war between France and England, the decline of the German Empire, the interneceine struggles in Italy and between the kingdoms of Spain, and, finally, the inability of the Slavs and Greeks to resist the Ottoman Turks, who seize Constantinople.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### THE GREAT SCHISM OF THE WEST.

The Great Schism of the West, brought about by the violence of Philip the Fair and the transfer of the Holy See to Avignon, comprises a period of seventy-one years (1378-1449), in which the Great Schism, properly so called (1378-1417), must be distinguished from the Schism of Ten Years (1439-1449).

**Sec. 1. Struggle of Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair; the Popes at Avignon (1305-1378).**

**THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN BONIFACE VIII. AND THE KING OF FRANCE (1296).**—The triumph of the Papacy was seemingly complete when, after worsting Frederick II. in its long conflict with him, the Second Council of Lyons—fourteenth œcumeneical—saw the reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches (1274). St. Gregory X., a sovereign pontiff whose power was adorned by the splendor of his virtues, had brought

about this desirable reconciliation. He preached a new Crusade against the infidels of the East, but his premature death and the short pontificates of his successors, to the number of eight in eighteen years, endangered the authority of the Holy See. The Greeks had again broken off into schism, and the Christians had lost their last foothold in the Holy Land before the accession of Boniface VIII. to the pontifical throne (1294). But sadder than this was the anarchy that reigned in Europe, which, no longer united in the warm faith of the Crusades, resounded with the strife of arms between princes contending for selfish, or at least private, interests. The king of France, Philip the Fair, not only invaded the English territories on the Continent, but he set his greed on Flanders, and as part of his plan enticed Count Guy of Dampierre to Paris, and there kept him in close captivity. To obtain the means to further his projects of conquest the ambitious monarch loaded his subjects with taxes and openly violated the immunities of the Church. Boniface VIII. interposed the authority of the Holy See. Boniface had great genius, and to his extensive knowledge joined inflexibility of character. His policy, like that of his predecessors for two centuries, was to oppose an united Europe to the aggressions of the Mohammedans. In his message to Philip the Fair the sovereign pontiff exhorted him to seek reconciliation with the king of England and to set the count of Flanders at liberty. At this time there appeared the bull *Clericis laicos*, which, under penalty of excommunication, forbade the clergy to pay, and the laity to require them to pay, any subsidy without the permission of the Holy See (1296).

This bull, couched in general terms, applied particularly to the king of England, who was more blame-worthy in this matter than the king of France. But Philip the Fair could not brook the legitimate intervention of the sovereign pontiff. He was of a proud and haughty disposition, and was surrounded by lawyers who flattered his natural leaning to irresponsible despotism. He defended his rights against Boniface, and declared that God alone was the judge of his acts. He enforced this declaration by forbidding any gold or silver money to be taken out of the realm without his express permission. This was an indirect confiscation of the dues hitherto paid the Holy See. All relations with the court of Rome were at once suspended. Philip was a powerful monarch, for he was not only king of France and Navarre, but he held the sovereigns of Spain and the princes of Naples and Hungary in his dependency. Against such an adversary the pope could expect no support from Germany, where the emperor was defending his throne from a rival, nor from Italy, torn by dissensions of the Guelphs and Ghibelines. And, in fact, the Ghibelines were the declared enemies of the Holy See. Through the influence of the Colonna family, who had just broken out in revolt, they held Rome at their mercy. To avoid the storm more tact than firmness was required by the head of the Church, who certainly used great condescension. Boniface, after modifying the import of the bull *Clericis laicos*, allowed Philip the Fair to levy subsidies on the French clergy, and succeeded in reconciling him with the king of England by acting the part of mediator, not as a sovereign pontiff but as a private individual; he even consented, for the sake of peace,

to pass over in silence the just grievances of the count of Flanders ; and, finally, he solemnly canonized King Louis IX., the grandfather of Philip the Fair, who then resumed friendly relations with the Holy See. The pope, victorious over the Colonnas, published the first secular jubilee for the year 1300. Pilgrims flocked to Rome from all nations ; so great were their numbers that a wide breach was opened in the walls of the city to afford them entrance.

NEW ATTACKS OF PHILIP THE FAIR ON BONIFACE VIII. (1301-1303).—Philip, not satisfied with giving asylum to the Colonnas who had been banished from Rome, made new exactions, infringed the liberties of the Church, and even seized upon the money left by a cardinal for the maintenance of needy students. Boniface desired to avoid a second rupture. His legate, Bernard de Saissset, Bishop of Pamiers, was directed to expostulate with the shuffling monarch. But Philip, far from heeding his words, dragged the legate of the Holy See before an incompetent tribunal, which threatened him with death and sentenced him to prison. The king sent the chancellor of France to Rome with a command to the pope to degrade the bishop of Pamiers and abandon him to the king's justice, "which in that case might be remitted as a sacrifice pleasing to God." Boniface, who was the legate's lawful judge, demanded his release. The chancellor's threatening tone led the pope to convoke a council for the next year. At the same time he published the bull *Ausculta fili*, which represents the sovereign pontiff as the chief and arbiter among Christian princes. The ill-advised Philip maintained that this bull assailed the independence of his crown, and, to prove it, circulated

a spurious copy, in which the pope was made to claim France as a fief of the Holy See. This outrage was followed by another : in presence of a numerous assembly Philip threw the bull *Ausculta fili* into the flames, and the act was proclaimed by sound of trumpet. The States-General, assembled for the first time in the church of Notre Dame at Paris, were solicited by the chancellor to lend their support in maintaining what he called “the ancient liberties of the nation” (1302). The nobility and the *tiers-états*, or commons, gained over beforehand, promised what was asked ; their letters to the cardinals even denied Boniface the title of pope. The clergy, though less servile, were yet weak enough to yield to the threat of being held guilty of treason. In the council of Rome, Boniface VIII. with just indignation declared that he had not dreamed of encroaching upon the temporal power of the king of France, but only of maintaining his right, like his predecessors, to judge all the actions of princes, as of the rest of the faithful, in regard to sin. This was the substance of the celebrated bull *Unam sanctam*, which represented the two powers as two swords : one spiritual, confided to the Church ; the other temporal, and placed in the hands of Christian princes (1302).

In spite of Philip’s formal prohibition thirty-nine French bishops attended the Council of Rome. The king of France seized the revenues of their dioceses and adopted extreme measures against the sovereign pontiff. A second assembly of the States-General was convoked at the Louvre (1303). This assembly declared Boniface VIII. an usurper, and a heretic guilty of intercourse with the devil and of all the infamies that the blackest hatred could imagine. The

king of France was entreated, as defender of the faith, to call a general council for the election of a legitimate pope. Philip easily consented to what he himself had suggested. His summons to the future council, being published throughout France, was responded to by many who had been deceived or intimidated.

OUTRAGE AT ANAGNI (SEPTEMBER 7, 1303).—William de Nogaret, one of the most hostile legists to the Holy See, and whose grandfather had been burned alive as an Albigensian heretic, was sent to notify Boniface of the French king's summons. Nogaret set out for Italy with full powers and a large sum of money. His barefaced hypocrisy attracted a few hundred mercenary bandits. As though a zealous defender of the Holy See, he displayed the gonfalon of St. Peter side by side with the banner of France, and marched upon Anagni. This was the native place of Boniface VIII., who had withdrawn there and had no defenders but his fellow-citizens. Treachery opened the gates of Anagni to his enemies, who rushed to his palace with shouts of “Long live the king of France ! Death to Pope Boniface !”

The august old man of eighty-six, unterrified by the approach of his persecutors, commanded the doors of his palace to be thrown open, that he might suffer martyrdom for the Church of God. Attended only by two cardinals, who alone remained faithful to him amid danger, he sat on his throne, vested with the pontifical ornaments, the tiara on his head, and holding in one hand the cross, and the keys of St. Peter in the other. The mercenary soldiers were struck with awe by the spectacle. When Nogaret threatened to take him to Lyons, fettered like a cri-

minal, there to be tried by the pretended council, the pope replied : "Here is my head ; I long to die for the faith of Jesus Christ and his Church." The brutal Sciarra Colonna overwhelmed him with insults, and it is said by some that he even struck the pope in the face with his iron gauntlet. The firmness of the vicar of Jesus Christ was unshaken by three days of rigorous captivity. At last the citizens gave way to their indignation, drove out the troops of Nogaret, and trampled the banner of France in the mud. The venerable pontiff was no sooner restored to liberty than he generously granted a pardon to the prisoners and to all who had betrayed him. A joyful welcome was given him on his return to Rome ; but the Roman lords disputed the honor of keeping the pope in their power, under pretext of protecting him. Boniface VIII. at last succumbed to the anguish and torments of continued persecution (October, 1303).\*

CLEMENT V. (1305-1314) ; TRANSFER OF THE HOLY SEE TO AVIGNON (1309) AND THE COUNCIL OF VIENNE (1311-1312).—Evil consequences resulted to the Church from the outrage of Anagni. Benedict XI. was the successor of Boniface VIII. To be independent he left Rome, and deemed it prudent to revoke the censures pronounced against Philip the

\* The horror caused among the Italians by the outrage of Anagni was well expressed by the poet Dante Alighieri : "I behold him ; he enters Anagni with the fleur-de-lis. I behold Christ captive in his vicar ; I see him mocked a second time ; he is again drenched with gall and vinegar ; he is put to death between thieves." The *Divine Comedy* of Dante, begun in 1292 and finished in 1320, is regarded as one of the finest of all poems. Its influence, the works of the lyric poet Petrarch, the discovery of several masterpieces of ancient art, the increased intercourse with the Greeks, and the enlightened patronage of the popes and princes, brought about the literary movement of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries known as the Renaissance.

Fair. But after solemnly excommunicating Nogaret and his accomplices the virtuous pontiff died suddenly, some say of poison, at Perugia (1304).

At the end of ten months the conclave elected a Frenchman named Bertrand de Got, who was archbishop of Bordeaux. He was crowned at Lyons under the name of Clement V. As Rome and the surrounding countries were a prey to constant civil war, the new pope resolved to fix his residence at Avignon. But by this act the papal authority lost much of its prestige. It became easy to charge that the Holy See was no longer independent, since it was established in the states of a foreign prince.

There is no doubt that the kings of France too often interfered with the action of the popes of Avignon. Urged by an undying hatred of Boniface VIII., Philip pressed Clement to declare him a heretic, to erase his name from the catalogue of popes, to burn his body and scatter his ashes to the wind. Clement, while determined not to submit to that dishonor, convoked the Fifteenth Oecumenical Council at Vienne (1311). Boniface VIII. was declared a legitimate and orthodox pope. Philip the Fair, once more absolved, insisted upon finishing the trial of the Templars. In 1307 he had caused the arrest on the same day of all the knights of that order in his kingdom. A great number of knights, when examined by the pope himself or by his commissaries, made most astounding disclosures. The testimony of six hundred Templars in Italy, France, Germany, Spain, and England showed that the order had become enormously rich, and was infected with profligacy, apostasy, impiety, and other abominable crimes. The sovereign pontiff, after mature exami-

nation, being convinced that this order, far from being now of any utility, was rather an object of scandal to the Church, suppressed it in the Council of Vienne (1312). While the papal commissaries were deliberating on the case of the grand master, Jacques Molay, who was in the royal custody, the king, without waiting for sentence, had him burnt alive on a small island of the Seine at Paris (1314). At the same time that it is just to admit the wisdom of Clement V. in these memorable proceedings, Philip's conduct cannot be defended. Philip persecuted the Templars with so stubborn a cruelty that, considering his former career, it can hardly be believed that he brought about the suppression of the Templars for anything but selfish reasons. A pontifical bull transferred their possessions to the Knights Hospitalers, but the king kept the greater part of what he had confiscated.

NICHOLAS RIENZI ; THE GOOD STATE (1347).—The popes of Avignon, who were anxious for a new crusade against the encroaching Mohammedans in the East and for a reconciliation of the Greek Church, vainly strove to bring about peace in the West, and particularly in Italy. But they were continually harassed by the emperors of Germany, who fomented the disturbances of the Ghibelines in the peninsula. Pope John XXII. began a struggle with Louis of Bavaria and maintained it with energy (1316–1334). Benedict XII. (1334–1341) continued it with moderation. It was closed by the more fortunate Clement VI. (1341–1352), who humbled the schismatical emperor, but was startled by the news of another outbreak in Rome. The capital of Christendom, deserted by the sovereign pontiffs, had passed

under the yoke of the tyrannical nobles. The sight of the public woes stirred the indignation of a young Roman named Nicholas Rienzi, who was the son of a tavern-keeper. He had received a good education, and had learned to admire the ancient institutions of Rome, which his warm imagination made him think would raise his country to its former splendor. Shortly before a senator had placed the laurel crown upon the head of the poet Petrarch at the Capitol (1314). The unwonted splendor of that long-disused ceremony left a deep impression. Rienzi seized the opportunity to contrast the present misery of the Romans with the glory of their ancestors. He combined a noble bearing with a ready, irresistible eloquence, so that he easily induced the down-trodden Romans to accompany him to the Capitol, where they proclaimed the republic of the “Good State” (1347). At the height of this enthusiasm Rienzi was declared “Tribune and Liberator of Rome.” His rule at first realized the fairest hopes. The tribune revived peace and concord among the citizens; he compelled the lords to remain in their castles, and solicited the cities of Italy to join the Romans in re-establishing the republic. From his retreat of Vaucluse the illustrious Petrarch in his verses sounded the praise of the new liberator as a man greater than Camillus or the Scipios. Less popularity would have been enough to turn the demagogue’s head. He not only had himself dubbed a knight in the basilica of St. John Lateran, but he encircled his brow with six crowns and summoned the emperor to appear before his tribunal. Cleaving the air with his sword in three different directions before the assembled multitude, he cried out at every stroke:

“This is mine!” To maintain his insane pretensions he displayed scandalous luxury, and added to his titles those of Champion of Italy and of Lover of the Universe. His tyranny and exactions at last ruined him with the people. Excommunicated by the pope and besieged by the Roman lords, Rienzi vainly rang the alarm from the belfry of the Capitol; no one heeded his summons, and he sorrowfully gave up a power which, in less than seven months, had reduced Rome to a condition even worse than before.

URBAN V. AND GREGORY XI. AT ROME.—The capital of Christendom enjoyed neither peace nor greatness during the absence of the sovereign pontiffs. To Rienzi’s ill-ordered attempt at a republic succeeded the tyrannical rule of the lords. The most terrible pestilence which had ever ravaged Europe, the black plague, aggravated the evils of anarchy. Pope Innocent VI. (1352–1362), desiring to re-establish the pontifical authority in the States of the Church, sent thither Cardinal Albornoz in the capacity of legate. Nicholas Rienzi should have aided this pacific mission. The ambitious tribune, after having been delivered up by the emperor to the sovereign pontiff, who set him at liberty, again ascended the Capitol in triumph. The people, however, whom he had again led captive by his eloquence, soon wearied of his tyranny and pitilessly slew him (1354). Cardinal Albornoz, rid of his dangerous auxiliary, displayed such courage and ability that by the end of a few years he had recovered all the territories of the Church. The hour seemed at hand for the Papacy to return to its proper dwelling-place. In vain did interested counsellors seek to fix it in France. Pope Urban V. (1362–1370), not heeding

the threats of the king of France or the murmurs of the cardinals, embarked for Italy. His entrance into Rome was a real triumph (1367). Among the royal visitors were the emperors of Germany and the emperor of the East. John Palæologus even made a solemn abjuration of the Greek schism. Urban V., by his residence in Rome, had acquired great influence throughout Christendom, when he yielded to the desire of returning to France. St. Bridget of Sweden had foretold that as soon as he should re-enter Avignon he would die of a distressing malady, and the event verified the prediction.

The Romans were indignant at the election of Gregory XI. as successor of Urban. He was the third Frenchman who had worn the tiara in thirty years. They threatened to choose a pope of their own to put an end to what they called the "Babylonian Captivity." The exhortations of St. Catherine of Sienna and the apprehension of schism urged Gregory to accomplish his vow of quitting Avignon for ever. He set out for the Eternal City, despite the entreaties of relatives, the representations of King Charles V., and the expectation of perils awaiting him in Italy. The people of Rome received him with shouts of joy (1377), but most of the neighboring cities, upon hearing the watchword "liberty" sounded by the Florentines, unfurled the standard of revolt. Cardinal Robert of Geneva was sent to bring them into subjection, but he had only bands of French mercenaries who were more eager to gather plunder than to restore order. This anarchy afflicted Gregory, who had also to suffer the insolence of the Roman lords and the attacks of the English heretic Wickliffe. What still more hastened

the death (1378) of the pope was the presentiment of the schism so soon to desolate all Christendom.

**Sec. 2. The Great Schism (1378–1417); Councils of Pisa (1409) and Constance (1414–1418); the Ten Years' Schism (1439–1449); Councils of Basle (1431–1439) and Florence (1438–1442).**

**DOUBLE ELECTION OF URBAN VI. AND OF CLEMENT VII. (1378).**—The cardinals, conformably to the dying wish of Gregory XI., at once met in conclave to elect his successor by plurality of votes. Divided into three parties, they could come to no agreement. The Limousins, who were in the majority, resolved to elect a pope of their own province; but the others (French and Italians) agreed that the world was weary of Limousin popes. In the meantime the Romans, who feared a plot among the cardinals to transfer the Holy See again to Avignon, collected around the Vatican, shouting: “Give us a Roman pope!” A cardinal, frightened by the tumult, advised that a priest should be arrayed in pontifical robes and presented to the people as the new pope, so that by this stratagem the cardinals might retire to a place of safety and there proceed with the election. The conclave rejected this proposal as unworthy. It was, therefore, decided to proceed at once to the election, and nearly all the votes were given for Bartholomew Prignano, the Archbishop of Bari, who was not a member of the Sacred College (1378). Fearing that the election of a Neapolitan would excite the anger of the people, it was resolved to postpone the proclamation till the next day.

However, the impatient multitude broke in the

doors of the palace and invaded the conclave. The panic-stricken cardinals had barely time to escape into the castle of Sant' Angelo or the neighboring fields. Next day, seeing calm restored by the news of the recent election, they reassembled to proclaim it and to offer their homage to the pope, who took the name of Urban VI. Rome was full of rejoicing. Easter was celebrated with the utmost solemnity by the new pope, surrounded by the seventeen cardinals then present in Italy ; the six others at Avignon hastened to send in their adhesion and homage. The accession of Urban VI. was made known to all the princes and prelates of the Catholic world, and was everywhere hailed with joy, while for more than three months no one expressed a doubt that the Church had in her present head a legitimate successor of St. Peter.

Urban VI. created discontent by his direct way of attempting reforms. His incessant but well-deserved reproaches to the cardinals were nearly always expressed in an abrupt and imperious tone, more calculated to irritate the delinquents than to correct them. The cardinals, to escape his censures, sought refuge in Anagni, taking with them the pontifical tiara. There, screened by the personal enemies of Urban, they declared his election null and the Holy See vacant. In vain Urban proposed to submit his claims to the decision of a general council. Meeting in conclave, they almost unanimously nominated Cardinal Robert of Geneva, who took the name of Clement VII. (1378). Yet this same cardinal had, with his own hand, written to several princes to notify them of the election of Urban VI. as valid and conformable to the sacred canons. Urban VI.,

without further delay, excommunicated the anti-pope and all his adherents. Clement, having lost his troops, and being threatened with death by the Neapolitans, sailed for France (1379). His intention was to fix his residence at Avignon, where he was acknowledged as legitimate successor of the popes, who had dwelt there for seventy years.

**ANARCHY IN CHRISTENDOM.**—France soon declared for Clement VII., as did Scotland, Spain, Savoy, Naples, and the kingdom of Cyprus. The obedience of Urban VI. was more extensive, comprising England, Portugal, the Netherlands, nearly all Italy, Germany, Hungary, Poland, and the Scandinavian states. Catholic Europe, thus divided between two rival obediences, became the theatre of scandals and disorders hitherto unknown. The world saw two pontiffs, one at Rome and the other at Avignon, not only hurling the thunderbolts of the Church at one another, but levying troops, and in a war against Christians granting the same indulgences as in the Crusades against the infidels. To ruin Urban VI. Clement set Italy on fire, and sent Louis of Anjou there to uphold Queen Joanna I. and to conquer the States of the Church. On the other hand, Urban called upon Charles of Duras, who de-throned his cousin, the queen of Naples, and suffocated her between two mattresses. There was neither peace nor truce between the two parties, known as Urbanists and Clementines. In the same country, nay, often in the same city, implacable enmities hurried men on to the most criminal excesses. “Clerics were arrested by sea and by land,” says a contemporary, “ill-treated, and put to death by drowning, burning, or by some other violent means.”

So much disorder would have destroyed any other institution than the Catholic Church. But the Spouse of Jesus Christ has received immortal life and fecundity, and through all her trials she preserved the effective means of leading the faithful to salvation, and amid even frightful confusion some of her children displayed heroic virtues. Among the saints who edified the world by the splendor of their lives we may cite SS. Vincent Ferrer and Colette, and Blessed Peter of Luxembourg, under the obedience of Avignon ; and SS. Catherine of Sienna and Catherine of Sweden, Blessed Alfonso of Aragon, and St. Antoninus, Bishop of Florence, under the obedience of Rome. St. Antoninus gave a just and consoling rule for the faithful during the disastrous schism : “Although it is necessary to believe that there is, and can be, but one visible head of the Church, it is not necessary to believe that this or that rival claimant is the legitimate pope. All that is necessary to be believed is that the true and lawful pope is he who has been canonically elected, and an ordinary Christian is not obliged to discover which election has been canonical. He may safely follow the opinion and the conduct of his pastor.”

FUTILE EFFORTS TO HEAL THE SCHISM ; ELECTION OF ALEXANDER V. (1409).—The University of Paris, whose influence was at that time powerful in Europe, sought means to heal a schism so hurtful to Christendom. What rendered this task most difficult was the obstinate persistence of the two popes. Clement strove to support his claims by levying heavy contributions on the Church of France ; Urban VI., betrayed by several cardinals and attacked by his former ally, Charles of Duras, was occupied in main-

taining his power in Central Italy. Boniface IX., who succeeded him in 1389, evinced more zeal for the interests of the Church. In consequence of his advances to the king of France the University of Paris proposed three means of restoring unity. The first was by mutual cession, whereby the two claimants were to abdicate their dignity and leave matters to a new election. Should they refuse they were to be solicited to chose umpires to decide which of the two was the true pope ; this was termed the way of compromise or arbitration. Finally, if both claimants refused any amicable adjustment, recourse was to be had to the third means—the convocation of a general council to pronounce on their respective claims or name a new pope. Clement VII., called on to accept one of these three means, was so agitated that he soon after died (1394).

The death of Clement would have healed the schism had not the cardinals of his obedience hastened to give him a successor in the person of Peter de Luna, of Aragon. This cardinal was already famous for his ability and firmness. He had declared in conclave that he could as cheerfully resign the pontifical dignity as lay aside the cope in which he was robed. Once elected Benedict XIII., despite the urgent solicitations of cardinals, the threats of the king of France, and the assaults of a numerous army that besieged him in Avignon, he refused to accept the way of mutual cession. Innocent VII., the successor of Boniface IX., was equally obstinate. Gregory XII., having succeeded him in 1406, was desirous of restoring peace to the Church ; but he could come to no understanding with Benedict XIII. Then the cardinals of both obediences, supported by the prin-

cipal Catholic countries, agreed to convoke a council at Pisa. About a hundred bishops attended in person, and nearly two hundred by proxy. Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. refused to appear. Nevertheless the council, declaring itself oecumenical, pronounced the deposition of the two popes and the vacancy of the Holy See (1409). The twenty-two cardinals present, meeting in conclave, elected Alexander V. as pope. Their motive was good, but the act was irregular. Instead of two there were now three claimants of the Papacy, as well as three emperors in the empire.

END OF THE GREAT SCHISM ; ELECTION OF MARTIN V. (1417).—The Emperor Sigismund, being now sole master of the empire, desired to restore unity in the Church. At the solicitation of this wise monarch Pope John XXIII., who had succeeded Alexander V. in 1410, convoked a general council at Constance (1414). The emperor, more than 150 prelates, about 1,600 princes and lords of every rank, and a host of the faithful attended. On the motion of Peter d'Ailly, Cardinal Bishop of Cambrai, and of John Gerson, Chancellor of the University of Paris,\* the assembly declared itself independent of the Council of Pisa, and granted the right of suffrage to simple ecclesiastics, doctors, princes, and their representatives, which swelled the number of votes to 18,000. It was resolved that the vote should be taken collectively by nations. Five nations were represented : Italy,

\* According to certain critics, John Gerson is the author of the *Imitation of Christ*, "the most beautiful book that ever came from the hand of man, the Gospel being divinely inspired." Some attribute the *Imitation* to the Italian Benedictine Giovanni Gersen, but the most popular and widely-received opinion is that the author was Thomas à Kempis, canon of Cologne, who died about the year 1471.

Germany, France, England, and Spain. From the first it was agreed to demand the abdication, pure and simple, of the three popes. John XXIII., refusing, fled to Schaffhausen, disguised as a groom (1415). Arrested soon after by order of the emperor and deposed by the council, he renounced a title which, by his own admission, had not left him a single happy day. Gregory XII. made a more generous sacrifice for the good of the Church. After annulling the acts of the popes of Avignon and of Bologna, he confirmed all his own acts and those of his predecessors, convoked the council, and then resigned the pontifical dignity for ever. The unyielding Benedict XIII. was deposed. The twenty-three cardinals present at Constance then entered into conclave with thirty deputies of the council, and unanimously elected Cardinal Otto Colonna, who took the name of Martin V. (1417).

The great schism was closed. Benedict XIII., isolated on the rock of Peñiscola, in the kingdom of Aragon, continued to call himself pope and to hurl his harmless thunderbolts. He had an anti-pope for successor, who finally acknowledged Martin V. A more serious danger lay in the decrees of Constance against the rights of the Holy See. The assembly, assuming unlimited power, had attempted to reform the Church both in her members and in her chief; it had even decreed the periodical assembly of general councils, which it declared superior to the pope. Martin V., declining to sanction these claims, postponed their examination to the next council and closed that of Constance.

**HERESY AND DEATH OF JOHN HUSS (1415).**—The Council of Constance had been assembled not only

to restore unity and introduce reforms in the Church but also to suppress the evil of heresy. The errors which John Wickliffe had spread in England had got access to Bohemia, and were beginning to infect the neighboring countries. The heresy was made more contagious by the reputation and influence of its leader in Bohemia, John Huss, the rector of the University of Prague. Under pretext of attacking the abuse of indulgences he went so far as to deny their lawfulness, the primacy of the pope, the infallibility of the Church, the right of the clergy to possess temporalities, the power of forgiving sins, and the honor due to saints and images. This bold heresiarch admitted no other authority than Holy Scripture interpreted by reason, and thus rendered the laity as competent as bishops to judge in matters of faith. In this way his doctrines gained some credit among the Bohemian people and nobles, and hence arose disturbances that neither the censures of the archbishop of Prague nor the intervention of the pope could allay. John Huss had appealed to a future council. Cited before the Council of Constance, he wrote that he was ready to be judged and punished if convicted of error. The Emperor Sigismund then gave him a safe conduct, which did not guarantee him from the punishment to which he had professed his readiness to submit, but protected him during his journey to the council, and procured him an opportunity to defend himself, if he could, from what he had stated to be calumnies.

John Huss, having reached Constance, was examined, convicted of error, and imprisoned. His writings and those of Wickliffe were publicly burnt. As he obstinately refused to retract, he was solemnly

degraded from holy orders, and given up to the magistrates of Constance, who, in accordance with the laws of the empire, condemned him to be burnt. His disciple, Jerome of Prague, suffered the same punishment. The sectaries of John Huss, called Hussites, took up arms and ravaged Bohemia and the surrounding countries with fire and slaughter.

EUGENIUS IV. (1431-1447) AND THE COUNCIL OF BASLE; THE ANTI-POPE FELIX V. (1439).—A new council, convoked at Basle by Pope Martin V., was not opened till under his successor, Eugenius IV. (1431). The assembly, in concert with the sovereign pontiff, extinguished the heresy of the Hussites; but in separating from the vicar of Christ it made only powerless and scandalous attempts to settle the two other points at issue—the reform of the Church and the reconciliation of the Greeks. From the outset it renewed the pretensions of Constance against the legitimate authority of the Holy See. A decree, issued by fourteen prelates, of whom only six were bishops, declared the council to be superior to the pope, and that it could not be dissolved or transferred without its own consent. A papal bull, which prorogued the Council of Basle on account of the insufficient number of prelates, was regarded as null and void; Eugenius was even summoned to appear at Basle within three months. The Emperor Sigismund, dreading another schism, effected a momentary reconciliation. But other Christian princes and the University of Paris countenanced the assembly in its assumptions. After proclaiming the superiority of councils and their periodical reunion, it decreed the election of bishops by diocesan chapters, put a limit to appeals to the court of Rome, restricted

the pecuniary rights of the Holy See, and arrogated the privilege of publishing indulgences throughout Christendom. Because Eugenius IV. had protested and had transferred the council to Ferrara, he was cited to appear with the cardinals within sixty days. The pope was condemned for contumacy, as a disturber of peace and as an obstinate heretic, and was declared to have forfeited the pontifical dignity. A mock conclave, composed of one cardinal and thirty-two ecclesiastics of every grade, pretended to elect a new pope in the person of Amadeus VIII., who five years before had resigned the ducal crown of Savoy. This prince reluctantly consented to leave his delightful monastic retreat of Ripaille to assume the tiara as Felix V. (1439).

These scandals threw all Christendom into commotion. Although Catholic sovereigns disapproved of them, they seized the occasion to enforce several schismatical decrees of the Council of Basle ; hence the Germanic Pragmatic Sanction promulgated by the emperor, and the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438) published by the king of France, destined to be the basis of the so-called “Liberties of the Gallican Church.” The most learned and pious of the Council of Basle, foreseeing the woes in store for the Church, withdrew, exclaiming : “This is not the Church of God, but the synagogue of Satan.”

**REUNION OF THE GREEKS (1439) AND END OF THE SCHISM (1449).**—Pope Eugenius IV., having excommunicated the assembly of Basle and annulled all its decrees, had just opened at Ferrara a council, which the following year was transferred to Florence. Its object was to bring about the reconciliation of the Greek and Latin churches, which had been so long

desired. The emperor, John Palæologus, was present at the deliberations of the council. The patriarch of Constantinople and the most learned and distinguished prelates and others of the Eastern empire were there. After long discussions the far-famed Bessarion, Archbishop of Nicæa, and other Greek prelates confessed the primacy of the Holy See, the existence of Purgatory, the use of unleavened bread for the sacrament of the Eucharist, and even the procession of the Holy Ghost from both the Father and the Son. Then the Greeks and Latins made the same profession of faith and embraced with transports of joy (1439). These glad tidings filled the Catholic world with jubilation. It was the triumph of the pontifical authority at the time when the Council of Basle, having signally failed in its negotiations with the Greeks, completely lost favor by its very excesses. The plague soon scattered its members, and the anti-pope, Felix V., sought refuge in Lausanne. Deserted by the German princes and the king of France, who called him "My Lord of Savoy," he put an end to the scandalous farce by a voluntary abdication (1449). The successor of Eugenius was Nicholas V. (1447–1455), who had the glory of healing the schism. He wiped out its last trace in Germany by the Germanic Concordat. His authority was enhanced by a long-since obsolete ceremony—the solemn coronation at Rome of the German Emperor Frederick by the sovereign pontiff (1452).

It was the last time Rome was to witness this imposing ceremony. The next year brought news of the fall of Constantinople. In vain did Nicholas V. and his successors preach a crusade against the Otto-

man Turks. The great schism, by weakening faith, had rendered Christians less sensible to its benefits and to the fear of the papal thunders. The Holy See had lost its former hold on Catholic governments, while its spiritual authority was jeopardized both by the assumptions of Gallicanism and by the growing germs of a heresy which in the coming century would, at the call of Luther, sever the half of Christian Europe from the Church.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### FRANCE AND ENGLAND—THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR.

France and England, having become the most powerful nations of the West, contend in a war of a hundred years (1337–1453), divided into two periods by the death of Charles V. (1380). France, in each period, after sustaining great disasters, retrieves them by brilliant successes.

**Sec. 1. The Last Capets and the First Three Valois (1270–1380); *Struggle of the Three Plantagenet Edwards (1272–1377) against France and Scotland.***

**GREATNESS OF FRANCE UNDER THE LAST CAPETS.**  
—Philip III., the Bold (1270–1285), the son and successor of St. Louis, had gloriously ended the last Crusade. On his return to France he received the rich inheritance of the counts of Toulouse by the death of his brother Alphonse of Poitiers. Although unsuccessful in his wars against Castile in behalf of his disinherited nephews, or against Aragon in re-

venge for the Sicilian Vespers, he at least obtained for his son Philip the hand of Joanna, the heiress of Navarre and Champagne. Philip IV., the Fair (1285–1314), acquired not only his wife's dower but also the great city of Lyons. He undertook, too, the conquest of Guienne, but was soon obliged to restore this province to Edward I., as the dowry of his daughter Isabella, who espoused the heir of the English throne. It was an easier task to despoil Guy of Dampierre, Count of Flanders (1297). The Flemings then, exasperated by the tyrannical administration set over them, cut the French army to pieces under the walls of Courtrai (1302). Philip, having taken partial vengeance at the victory of Mons (1304), agreed to evacuate all the country, except Lille and other fortified towns of French Flanders.

Thus the crown domains under Hugh Capet, bounded by the Seine and the Loire, under Philip the Fair extended between the Rhone and the Mediterranean Sea, the Atlantic Ocean and the Scheldt. Philip, powerful abroad by alliance and arms, was loyally obeyed by his lords and other subjects, whom he burdened with exorbitant taxes. His courtiers flattered his ambition by the project of a monarchy embracing Europe and the Eastern empire; but Philip devoted the latter years of his reign to the humiliation of the Holy See and the ruin of the Templars. This conduct, so unworthy a grandson of St. Louis, was overtaken with deserved chastisement. Philip's three sons, Louis X. le Hutin (the Stubborn), Philip V., the Long, and Charles IV., the Fair, during a space of fourteen years successively filled the throne, and the crown then passed to the family of Valois (1328).

EDWARD I. (1272-1307); CONQUEST OF WALES (1283) AND SCOTLAND (1297):—Edward I., having returned from the Holy Land, at once set to work to remedy the evils resulting from the civil war which he had so happily ended under the reign of his father, Henry III. Wiser than his predecessors, he confined his attempts at conquest to Great Britain. Wales was peopled by the Celtic Britons, who had found a shelter in its mountain fastnesses from the attacks of the Anglo-Saxons. They had never more than partially submitted to English sovereignty, and when Llewellyn, prince of North Wales, was summoned to pay homage to Edward I., he yielded only through compulsion, and seized the first opportunity to take up arms. The Welsh responded to his appeal, but their native courage, roused to the highest pitch by the war-songs of the bards, was powerless against numbers and discipline; their prince fell, arms in hand, and his head, wreathed with ivy, was exposed by the conqueror on the Tower of London. Edward I. remained master of the country (1283), and took measures to conciliate the inhabitants. In Caernarvon Castle his queen, Eleanor of Castile, gave birth to a son, the heir to the English crown (1284). A great number of the Welsh chiefs assembled to offer their homage to Edward three days afterwards. They asked for a prince of their own nation—one knowing neither French nor Saxon, which languages were difficult for a Celtic ear to understand. Edward then had his infant son presented to them, declaring at the same time that he had been born in Wales, and knew neither French nor English, and was therefore the very prince they had asked for. From that day the

male heir to the English crown has borne the title of the Prince of Wales. But though the Britons of Wales were forced to succumb, it was not without sorrow that they lost their independence. This was the despairing cry of one of the bards of the vanquished : “ O Christ ! O my Saviour ! let me go down to the tomb, now that the name of a bard is vain and empty.”

Edward soon had an opportunity to make a still more important conquest. Scotland, converted to the faith by St. Columbkille, was known to the Latin chroniclers as *Scotia Minor*, as has been stated elsewhere. The southern and eastern parts of the country, known as the Lowlands, were inhabited by the descendants of the Saxons and Scandinavians, who spoke a dialect of English ; while the northern and western parts, known as the Highlands, as well as the Hebrides and the islands on the west coast, were possessed by the Celtic tribes of Gaels, or Scots, who were of Irish origin, and made their first colony in Scotland at Argyle (the land of the Gael). Their language was and still is the Gaelic, common to them and the Celtic Irish. By the middle of the ninth century the Scots had extended their dominions over the Picts (painted men), who were a Celtic people related to the Britons, and over all the other inhabitants of the country. Their royal dynasty became extinct in the person of Alexander III. (1286), and a crowd of aspirants for the throne appeared, chief among whom were John Baliol and Robert Bruce. They were both of Anglo-Norman race, though of the royal blood by their mother’s side. Edward I., chosen as arbitrator, decided in favor of Baliol, on condition that he would acknowledge

himself as vassal of the crown of England. The new king sought to evade this humiliating condition. Thinking himself strong in the alliance of Philip the Fair, he asserted his independence by force of arms, but he was taken prisoner, sent first to the Tower of London, and thence to his own domains in Normandy (1297). By an act of perfidy characteristic more of England than France, kings Philip and Edward mutually sacrificed their allies, the Scots and the Flemings. Edward easily gained possession of Scotland. His tyrannical government soon caused discontent, which spread among all classes. A private gentleman, named William Wallace, took up arms against the Southrons, as the English were called, and made himself feared by his courage, boldness, and activity. Victorious on many occasions, he would have freed Scotland had it not been for the jealousy and suspicion which everywhere prevailed. At the battle of Falkirk, just as he was about to win the day, a body of cavalry, mostly Scottish nobles, basely deserted him, as they could not bring themselves to give cordial support to one not of noble blood. This hero of independence was at last betrayed, and, being brought to London, was tried and beheaded as a traitor, leaving a name justly popular among his countrymen (1305).

Among the lords most hostile to him was Robert Bruce, a grandson of John Baliol's competitor. One day, after a bloody engagement with the Scots, having sat down to table without washing his hands, he heard some Englishmen saying in an undertone : "See that Scot eating his own flesh." Shamed by these words, Robert withdrew to a chapel hard by,

and, asking God's pardon for his treason to Scotland, made a solemn vow never to fight again but for the liberty of his country. Proclaimed king of Scotland soon afterwards (1306), he engaged in a desperate struggle with the English. Edward I. was advancing against him when he died. He charged his son to have his body boiled and his skeleton detached and carried at the head of the army to render it invincible against the Scots.

**DISASTROUS REIGN OF EDWARD II. (1307-1327).**—Edward II. had neither his father's implacable hatred nor his great courage, and soon returned to London. The new monarch, naturally weak and indolent, gave himself up to a life of ease and pleasure. An unworthy favorite, Piers Gaveston, was invested with great power, which he employed in the furtherance of his selfish and immoral designs. The English barons, with their national jealousy of foreigners, leagued against Gaveston, and the unfortunate man, of whom they had individually been afraid, having fallen into their hands, was beheaded. The king, constrained to pardon the rebels, followed rather than led them against Scotland. The opposing armies met at Bannockburn (1314); the English numbered about fifty thousand, the Scots four thousand. At daybreak the abbot of Inchaffray said Mass in presence of the Scottish army, and then, bearing a crucifix, led them into line of battle, where they knelt and prayed. The English were completely routed, and, it was often said, "drew their first breath at Durham." By this victory—almost the only one ever gained by the Scots for their own benefit—Bruce secured the independence of his country.

England's disasters were still further aggravated

by a horrible famine. Edward, insensible to public woes, surrendered his power to his new favorites, the two Spencers. His queen, Isabella, under a false pretext landed in France. Her real motive was to find the means of dethroning her husband. Edward, deserted by all, consented to abdicate the throne (1327). Parliament, which had taken the direction of affairs, entrusted the government to the Prince of Wales. The barons were anxious to be rid of Edward, and encouraged, it is supposed, by Queen Isabella, the persecuted king was foully murdered in such a way that no trace might be left of the crime. His cruel death excited compassion, for he appeared less blameworthy than unfortunate.

PHILIP VI. OF VALOIS (1328-1350) AND EDWARD III. (1327-1377); BATTLES OF CRECY AND NEVIL'S CROSS (1346).—The direct line of the Capets being extinct in Charles IV., the Fair, two claimants for the crown of France appeared—Philip, Count of Valois, on his father's side a grandson of Philip III., and Edward III., King of England, whose mother, Isabella, was the daughter of Philip the Fair. The Salic law, excluding women, had been appealed to for the benefit of the two last Capetians, and it was now applied for the third time in favor of Philip of Valois, who was proclaimed king under the name of Philip VI.

His first act was to annex the province of Champagne to the crown, leaving the kingdom of Navarre to Joanna, the daughter of Louis le Hutin, and wife of the count of Evreux. The same year Philip went to the assistance of his vassal, the count of Flanders, whose subjects had revolted against his exactions. The brilliant victory won by the French

at Cassel over the insurgent Flemings (1328) determined the English king to do homage to Philip for his duchy of Guienne; but he soon broke with the French king, whom he looked upon as a rival rather than as his suzerain. Edward III., proclaimed king of England at the age of fifteen, had all the qualities that make a great ruler—wisdom, firmness, courage, and rare ability in the execution of his designs. His mother, Isabella, aimed at reigning in his name in consort with her favorite, Roger Mortimer. The young prince, under their influence, was persuaded to acknowledge the independence of Scotland and to promise his sister's hand to David Bruce, son of King Robert. But soon afterwards, profiting by the general discontent, he shook off the galling control. Mortimer was hanged and Isabella shut up in Castle Riding, where she spent the remaining twenty-seven years of her life expiating her crimes. At the same time (1329) the death of Robert Bruce gave Scotland up to anarchy. His son, David II., only four years old, had a dangerous rival in Edward Baliol, who revived the claims of his father to the crown of Scotland. The English king was only too glad to take part in the dispute. He gained a great victory over the Scots under the regent, Douglas, at Halidon Hill (1333), and Baliol was established on the Scottish throne as Edward's vassal.

Edward III. was influenced by the advice of Robert of Artois, the brother-in-law and mortal enemy of the French king. Philip VI., unable to induce Edward to surrender the traitor's person, by way of reprisal ordered the count of Flanders to arrest all the English on his domains. Edward, on the other hand, forbade his subjects to sell English wool or to

buy Flemish cloths. This measure threatened to ruin Flemish manufactures, for it deprived them at once of the raw material and their principal market. An insurrection broke out under Jacob van Arteveld, a brewer of Ghent, and head of the trades-guilds of that city. The king of England, only awaiting a favorable opportunity, declared war against Philip of Valois (1337). By the advice of Arteveld he proclaimed himself king of France, quartered the French lilies with the arms of England, and embarked for the Continent. The French fleet that was to prevent his landing was utterly destroyed in the harbor of Sluys (1340). Edward was unsuccessful in the north of France, but in Brittany he maintained the claims of the Montfort family to that duchy. He undertook another expedition. After immense preparations he landed in Normandy and pillaged the country south of the Seine almost to Paris. Philip moved to attack him, when Edward suddenly crossed the Seine and halted in the forest of Crécy. Here he had the advantage of position. His foresight, the skill of the English bowmen, the startling effects of his five or six pieces of cannon, and the valor of the Prince of Wales, known as the Black Prince, then in his sixteenth year, secured him a decisive victory over a much larger but rash and undisciplined army. As a result of this victory, Calais fell into Edward's hands, and thus gave the English an easy landing-place in France.

Success was still more signal in England. David Bruce, having regained his authority in Scotland, profited by Edward's absence to invade his kingdom at the instigation of Philip VI., but the queen of England, Philippa of Hainaut, displayed an energy

and ability worthy of her husband himself. David, beaten and taken prisoner at Nevil's Cross, was incarcerated in the Tower of London (1346). Baliol, having ceded his right to the English king, relapsed into obscurity. Edward, now sole master of all Great Britain, had nothing further to fear from France, which was decimated by the terrible Black Plague. Philip died with the reputation of a brave but impulsive and improvident king. During his reign France acquired Dauphiny, whose last count palatine was Humbert II. A condition of its cession was that the heir to the French crown should bear the title of Dauphin.

**JOHN II., THE GOOD, AND EDWARD III. (1350-1364).**—John II., surnamed the Good, had all his father's defects and graver difficulties to overcome. The States-General undertook to limit the royal authority, and Charles, the wicked Count of Evreux and King of Navarre, secretly intrigued with the English. King John had this faithless prince arrested, and undertook to occupy his domains in Normandy. But now appeared a more formidable enemy. The Black Prince advanced from Bordeaux to the centre of France. The French, whose forces were six times as great, attempted to crush him near Poitiers. They committed the same faults as at Crécy, and sustained a defeat as signal and still more disgraceful; for the king of France, being basely deserted, fell into the hands of the victor. John was treated as a king by the Black Prince, and as a prisoner of war by Edward III., who consigned him to the Tower of London.

This captivity threw France into a critical condition. The Dauphin, Charles, convoked the States-

General at Paris, but found them less disposed to uphold the cause of their country than to take advantage of its distress. Stephen Marcel, the provost of the merchants of Paris, was the leader of the popular party, whose army was given over to the command of Charles of Navarre, who soon betrayed it, when Marcel was assassinated (1358). At the same time the revolt of the peasants, called the "Jacquerie," took place and added to the general disorder. The dauphin wisely restored quiet, and still more wisely declined to ransom his father by the surrender of the territory on the Continent formerly possessed by the English. Edward III., after an useless invasion, signed the treaty of Bretigny (1360), by which he abandoned Poitou, Saintonge, and Limousin. John was conditionally liberated. Being unable to pay his ransom, he gave himself up again to his conqueror, saying: "If honor were banished from every other place it should find an asylum in the breasts of kings." He founded an order of knighthood called the Star, which soon fell into discredit. The Order of the Garter, founded by Edward III. (1349), still exists, with its well-known device, *Honni soit qui mal y pense* ("Shame to him who evil thinks").

CHARLES V. AND EDWARD III. (1364-1380); DU GUESCLIN.—Charles V., the Wise, had during his father's lifetime gained an experience which enabled him to retrieve the losses of France. Confined to his palace by ill-health, he confided the execution of his plans to the valiant knight Du Guesclin.

The greatest scourge of the time in France were the Free Companies, who sold their services to any who could pay for them. When unemployed by

others these brigands operated on their own account and were a terror to all parties. Du Guesclin, having assembled an army of these Free Companions, or Freebooters, led them into Spain, thus ridding France of their evil presence and making an ally of Henry of Trastamare, whom he placed upon the throne of Castile. Du Guesclin being taken prisoner again by the English, he fixed his own ransom at a great price. He soon secured the throne to Henry Trastamare, and thus led to a still more glorious triumph. The Black Prince himself gave the opportunity; his exactions having given rise to complaints among the Aquitanians, he was summoned by Charles V., his suzerain for that domain, before the court of peers (1369). Instead of appearing, the prince pillaged Limoges. This was his last exploit, his infirmities obliging him to return to England. The leaders who succeeded him were powerless against the bravery and skilful tactics of the constable Du Guesclin, who seized all their strongholds except Bordeaux, Bayonne, and Calais. The constable was fighting in Gévaudan when he died as a good Christian and a faithful servant of his king. He was undoubtedly the greatest general of the time. Charles V. soon followed him to the tomb, after having seen France delivered from the woes she had suffered under his two predecessors. Edward III., less fortunate, ended in gloom a reign begun in prosperity; his troops were driven from the Continent, and his beloved son, the Black Prince, snatched away by premature death. The English had truly said in reply to the French, who tauntingly asked when they would return to France: "We shall return when your sins are greater than ours!"

**Sec. 2. Anarchy in England and France; the Lancasters and Stuarts; Final Triumph of Charles VII.**

RICHARD II. (1377-1399); JOHN WICKLIFFE AND WAT TYLER.—Richard, son of the Black Prince, was but eleven years old when he took his grandfather's throne. His four uncles—the dukes of Clarence, Lancaster, York, and Gloucester—ruled England for their own emolument. Their tyranny and rapacity aggravated the evils of the war with France, and fomented an insurrection which had long been in preparation through the fanaticism and subversive doctrines of John Wickliffe and his followers, the Lollards. Wickliffe had taught theology in the University of Oxford, but, being disappointed in his hopes of becoming bishop, threatened to have full revenge on the Holy See. He found an opportunity in the unwillingness of Edward III. to pay the tribute, as his predecessors had done. Wickliffe defended the monarch's obstinacy, and had his reward in a rich benefice and the protection of the court. Emboldened by this success, he denied the primacy of the Holy See, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the necessity of baptism and of confession. He asserted that none but those entirely free from sin have a right to possess property or to hold office. Shortly after this a poll-tax was imposed, and this drove the peasantry to desperation (1381). An itinerant preacher named John Ball, a Wickliffite, addressed the furious crowds. He advised the levelling of all titles, differences, and distinctions, and insisted that all things should be held in common. He was a communist. The text of his first sermon was :

“ When Adam delved and Eve span  
Where was then the gentleman ? ”

Wat Tyler, an Essex blacksmith, enraged at the brutality of one of the collectors, struck him dead with his hammer, and thus gave the first signal of revolt. A hundred thousand workmen and peasants (villeins) took up arms. They massacred the royal officials, plundered castles, and committed other excesses. On their march to London they sang the text of the Lollard sermon.

The insurgents, once masters of London, ravaged it with fire and slaughter. The king, to save the capital, enticed a large body of the rebels to a conference in the meadows outside the city at Mile End, under pretext of redressing their grievances. But Wat Tyler was not disposed to compromise. After killing the archbishop of Canterbury and others who had fallen into his hands, at the head of twenty thousand followers he met the king and a small party of horsemen in Smithfield. While addressing the sovereign he used a threatening gesture, whereupon the lord mayor of London stabbed the insurgent to the heart. A cry was raised from the armed multitudes; but, ere they could bend their cross-bows, Richard, though but fifteen years of age, galloped up and fearlessly addressed them. "What are ye doing, my lieges?" he said. "Wat was a traitor; come with me, and I will be your leader." They followed him then to Mile End, where the royal troops were drawn up, whose commander begged leave to charge the rebels. "Rebels," rejoined Richard in the hearing of the insurgents, "they are no more; these are my subjects and children." The young monarch, by this conciliatory language and by promises of redress, put down the rebellion. His promises were not kept, however,

and the ringleaders were executed soon after. As they had been Wickliffe's proselytes, a synod called at London (1382) formally pronounced a censure against the heresiarch, which was afterwards confirmed at Constance and Basle.

**DEPOSITION OF RICHARD II.; HENRY IV. (1399-1413) AND THE STUARTS.**—Richard found it easier to quell insurrection than to free himself from the tyranny of his uncles, who had Parliament and the barons on their side. An unfortunate expedition into Scotland emboldened his enemies. He had to give up his chief counsellors and surrender the exercise of power to his youngest uncle, the duke of Gloucester (1386). The ambitious duke, while pretending to reform abuses, only aggravated them by his exactions and cruelty. The Parliament became the servile tool of the most tyrannical measures. Richard made use of the general discontent to re-establish his authority (1389). His wise administration soon brought back peace and prosperity to the kingdom. The people blessed the rule of a prince solicitous for their weal, but the barons were displeased with their loss of power. They clamored against a truce with the king of France, whose daughter, Isabella, was married to Richard (1396). The factious duke of Gloucester rallied the malcontents, but was arrested by the king, conveyed to Calais, and there murdered in prison. Richard took revenge on all whom he had reason to fear, and even confiscated the inheritance of his uncle, the duke of Lancaster, whose son, Henry, was banished to the Continent.

Henry of Lancaster, who had many partisans in England, suddenly landed and raised the standard

of revolt. Richard was betrayed, thrown into prison, and forced to abdicate. In default of heirs to Richard, the crown reverted by right to the descendants of the duke of Clarence, the second son of Edward III. But Henry of Lancaster, whose father was the third son of Edward, had the advantage of his recent triumph, together with the support of the troops, the barons, and Parliament. He was proclaimed king of France and England (1399). The usurper took means to secure his throne. The hapless Richard, after a plot devised for his rescue, was found dead in his dungeon. Many English barons made an alliance with the Welsh, Scots, and the Anglo-Normans of Ireland to recover the throne for the house of Clarence; but Henry defeated them in the decisive victory of Shrewsbury (1403). Having nothing further to fear for his crown, he completed the reduction of Wales and struck a fatal blow at the authority of the Stuarts in Scotland.

David Bruce, King of Scotland, ten years a captive in the Tower of London, was set free by Edward III. As he was childless, he devised his inheritance to his nephew, Robert Stuart, a grandson, by his mother, of Robert I. (Bruce), and on his father's side the head of a family which, for three centuries, had held the office of steward. Robert II. (1371–1290) had a reign characterized by three peculiarities common to nearly all the rulers of the Stuart dynasty—weakness of the royal authority, intimate alliance with France, and a leaning to deceit and falsehood. His son, Robert III. (1390–1405), of a peaceful and indolent disposition, was less the head than the plaything of the Scottish lords. The management of affairs he left to his brother, the duke of Albany.

To give his son an education, and especially to secure his safety, he sent him to France on a vessel that was captured by English pirates. Henry IV., with the English disregard of the law of nations, although there was a truce with Scotland, treated the young prince as his prisoner. Robert died of grief. His heir was not set at liberty. The English king was eager to involve Scotland in anarchy, so that he might employ all his forces in a national war with France.

CHARLES VI. (1380 - 1422). — Charles VI., but twelve years old at the death of his father, Charles V., was kept in the guardianship of his uncles only to satisfy their ambition and rapacity. The great schism seemed to have let loose the tyrannical passions of princes and a spirit of turbulence among the people. While Paris was reeking with the sedition of the "Maillotins," all Flanders was in revolt under Philip van Arteveld, a son of the Jacob who had been slain by his own townsmen. Young Charles, victorious over the Flemings at Rosebecque (1382), restored order to his kingdom. But as he could not inspire his uncles with solicitude for the public good, he chose ministers to supersede them. The principal of these, Olivier de Clisson, Constable of France, was attacked one night and left for dead in a street of Paris. Charles, indignant at such an outrage, was meditating vengeance when he became deranged (1392). His uncles again eagerly seized the reins of state. One of them, Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, who had wedded the heiress of Flanders, governed the kingdom with as much authority as if he had been its sovereign. This excited the jealousy and resentment of Louis, Duke of Orleans, the king's

brother, and consequently first prince of the blood. The death of his rival soon left him in power, but he fell under an attack of John the Fearless, the new duke of Burgundy, who equalled his father in ambition and surpassed him in audacity and cruelty. The assassination of Louis of Orleans (1407) kindled civil war between the Burgundians and the Armagnacs. The latter had just taken Paris when the English began the Hundred Years' War.

**HENRY V. (1413-1422); BATTLE OF AGINCOURT (1415).**—Henry IV., snatched away by premature death, had charged his eldest son to secure the throne to the House of Lancaster by a war against France. Henry V. began his reign by a thorough change of life. From the rake and the libertine he had been he became affable and correct in his manners. His old boon companions were refused admittance to his society, while he lavished favors on Chief-Justice Gascoigne, who had once sent him to prison for a midnight frolic. All the proscribed of the preceding reign recovered their possessions and dignities. He was severe only to the Lollard insurgents under Sir John Oldcastle, one of his former associates in pleasure.

Henry V., finding himself equally popular and powerful in England, claimed the crown of France as his lawful inheritance. He landed at the mouth of the Seine, and took Harfleur after a five weeks' siege. As he was proceeding to Calais for the purpose of recruiting his forces, he was brought to a stand near Agincourt by an army four times greater than his own. He secured advantages similar to those at Crécy and Poitiers, while the French committed the same errors, resulting in a defeat which

cost them more than ten thousand men, including the constable of France. The unceasing wrangling of the French gave greater aid to the English. The Burgundians, on becoming masters of Paris, slew the count of Armagnac and his partisans (1418). The following year the Dauphin, Charles, who had narrowly escaped from the massacre of the Armagnacs, proposed an alliance with the duke of Burgundy for the purpose of expelling the English, but the assassination of John the Fearless plunged the kingdom into dire calamities, as Philip the Good, the new duke of Burgundy, sought only to avenge his father. Queen Isabella of Bavaria, an unnatural wife and mother, made common cause with him by the disgraceful treaty of Troyes (1420). The king of England married the daughter of Charles VI., and was solemnly acknowledged heir presumptive to the crown, in violation of the Salic law, and to the exclusion of the Dauphin, Charles, who withdrew to the provinces south of the Loire. France would perhaps have lost her independence had it not been for the premature deaths of the formidable Henry V. and of the unfortunate Charles VI.

HENRY VI. (1422–1471) AND CHARLES VII. (1422–1461); END OF THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR.—Henry VI., then in his cradle, was proclaimed king of England and France, under the protection of his uncles, the dukes of Bedford and Gloucester. The Dauphin, proclaimed king of France as Charles VII., held but a part of the kingdom, and seemed too sluggish to conquer the rest. The victorious English were confident of overcoming the young prince, whom, in derision, they called “King of Bourges.” They were already pressing round Or-

leans, and Charles was about to quit France, when he received unlooked-for succor. Joan of Arc, a simple peasant-girl of the village of Domremy, met the French court at Chinon, and announced to Charles that Heaven had commissioned her to deliver Orleans and to have him crowned in the city of Rheims (1429). The event justified this extraordinary assertion. After the coronation she declared her mission accomplished, and begged to be dismissed; but the king being unwilling to lose her services so soon, she undertook to defend Compiègne, and, notwithstanding her heroic efforts, fell into the hands of the English. The English found her guilty of witchcraft, and cruelly inflicted the penalty of that crime on her at Rouen (1431).

Thanks to the Maid of Orleans, factions were now at an end, and the French king re-entered his capital the following year. After a series of victorious campaigns a treaty of peace was concluded between the French and the English, by which the latter retained only Guienne and Normandy (1444). To cement peace Henry VI. wedded Margaret of Anjou, a daughter of the good King René. This marriage and the evacuation of Maine, which was the price paid for it, increased the discontent in England. The duke of Gloucester was still a favorite of the populace, despite his bad administration. He had set James I. (Stuart) at liberty (1424), on condition of his recalling the Scots in the service of the king of France; but James, after depriving the ambitious duke of Albany of his power and his life, had sent fresh succor to Charles VII., and even invaded England, when he fell beneath the vengeance of his barons. The duke of Gloucester, since the death of

his brother, the duke of Bedford, was foiled in all his undertakings on the Continent. Withdrawn from affairs through the influence of his uncle, the cardinal of Winchester, he died soon after in prison. The English called him the “good duke,” perhaps because of his hatred for France. The loss of Normandy (1450) augmented the English discontent and their contempt for the government. In vain the brave Talbot was recalled from Ireland to save Guienne; the “Achilles of England” was defeated and left dead on the plains of Castillon (1453).

The Hundred Years’ War was over. Of all their conquests on the Continent the English retained only Calais. So disastrous an end to so brilliant a series of successes could not but bring the House of Lancaster into ill repute. De la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, Henry’s prime minister, was accused of treason, and perished a victim to the popular indignation. An Irish adventurer, called Jack Cade (MacQuade), pretending to be Mortimer, cousin of the duke of York, appeared at Blackheath at the head of twenty thousand insurgents, and made known the grievances of the men of Kent. The king soon after went in pursuit of Cade with fifteen thousand men, but the adventurer put the royal troops to flight. He was able to occupy London for several days (1450), but shortly afterwards his adherents dispersed and he was slain by an esquire at Lewes. The occasion seemed favorable to Richard, Duke of York, to assert his claims to the crown through his mother, heiress of the duke of Clarence. As the House of York bore a white rose on its escutcheon and the House of Lancaster a red one, the civil war was known as the War of the Roses. England, in its turn, was about to

become the theatre of a bitter struggle at the very time that James II. (Stuart), the son and successor of James I., was preparing to avenge the outrages inflicted upon his father and the Scots.

France, on the contrary, in consequence of her opposition to foreigners, was united and powerful under the wise rule of her victorious king. Feared by her neighbors, she could repair in peace the evils she had undergone by invasion. It was not so easy, however, to remedy the harm done Christian Europe by this long rivalry, that impaired the influence of the two mightiest nations of the time, and had even led them to favor the scandals of the great schism and to disregard the progress of the Ottoman Turks.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### GERMANY, SWITZERLAND, AND ITALY.

The imperial power, divided by the multiplication of immediate fiefs, and almost annihilated by the great interregnum, can no longer be restored except by princes endowed with rich appanages. Three families especially strive for their own profit to enhance the power of the Germanic crown, which at last falls to the House of Austria. But Switzerland frees itself from this house and from the empire. In Italy the title of Emperor of the West is a bugbear for some, and for others a thing of the past; several republics and many independent monarchies are founded there.

##### **Sec. 1. Germany; the Three Imperial Families.**

RUDOLPH OF HAPSBURG (1273-1291); HOUSE OF AUSTRIA.—During this troubled period, when the European nations were undergoing countless humiliations, the Romano-Germanic empire and the Papacy,

the two supreme powers, and both elective, were passing through similar experiences. A long vacancy of the Holy See corresponded to the great interregnum. Then a holy pope, Gregory X. (1271-1276), consoled the Church, while a great emperor, Rudolph of Hapsburg (1273-1291), tried to restore the empire. One of the electors designated by the others to choose an emperor pronounced in favor of Rudolph, Count of Hapsburg, in Switzerland, and Landgrave of Upper Alsace (1273). He was fifty-five years of age, poor in lands, but blessed with three sons and six daughters. He was engaged in an assault on the city of Basle when informed of his election. It is related of him that once, as he was riding in the mountains, he overtook a priest carrying the Viaticum to a dying person. He alighted from his horse and made the priest take his place, while he on foot followed his God to the poor cabin of the dying man. He refused the priest's offer to return the horse, saying: "God forbid that I should mount a horse that has borne the King of kings." Setting out at once for Aix-la-Chapelle to be crowned, he required the oath of allegiance. As he had no sceptre in his hand, he took the cross from the altar, saying, "This sacred sign is better than a sceptre," and the vassals were obliged to swear on the cross. One of his daughters he gave in marriage to Louis of Bavaria, Count Palatine, and another to the duke of Saxony. He absolutely forbade private wars. The castles of the refractory lords were demolished. "I was not raised to the throne to hide myself," said the intrepid Rudolph. He restored public tranquillity in Germany. In the Council of Lyons, and in an interview with Pope Gregory X., he cemented the

union between the Papacy and the empire. But he would not undertake a journey to Italy, even to receive the imperial crown at Rome, so much did he fear the intrigues and misunderstand the character of the Italians.

This prince had a dangerous enemy beyond the mountains. Ottocar II. (1253–1278), King of Bohemia, master of Austria, Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, insolently protested against the election of Rudolph. Put under the ban of the empire and vanquished, the proud Ottocar was forced to give up his acquisitions, except Bohemia and Moravia. Two years later he again took arms, but was utterly beaten at Marchfeld, and fell pierced with seventeen mortal wounds (1278). The emperor bestowed one of his daughters in marriage on Ottocar's heir, and then gave Austria and the surrounding countries to his eldest son, Albert. This was the beginning of the powerful House of Austria.

On Rudolph's death (1291) the electors set aside his son for Adolph of Nassau, a petty prince, who trafficked rather than reigned, though he had not succeeded in enriching his family. Deposed by the diet, he was slain (1298) by Albert of Austria, who took his place on the throne, after buying the suffrages of all the electors. These last soon had cause to wish they had been more honest in the election. Albert was selfish and violent; he sought to indemnify himself by new domains, and only at a great cost of men and money could he be restricted to his hereditary possessions of Austria and Switzerland. But the latter country was already tired of the Hapsburgs, and sought to free itself. Albert I. was assassinated by his own nephew, John of Suabia, as he

was crossing the Reuss, at the foot of the heights on which stood the castle of Hapsburg (1308).

HOUSES OF WITTELSBACH (1314–1410) AND LUXEMBOURG (1308–1437).—Although detesting the parricide, the electors took care not to choose one of Albert's six sons; the count of Luxembourg was elected under the name of Henry VII. (1308–1313). Like Rudolph of Hapsburg, this petty prince enriched his family by endowing it with an hereditary kingdom; and Bohemia became for more than a century the support of the Luxembourgs. But Henry VII., without the prudence of Rudolph, threw himself into Italy in the midst of discontented Guelphs and ambitious Ghibelines who had not seen an emperor for sixty years. By his visit to Italy he obtained the imperial crown, but lost his honor and his life (1313). His son John, King of Bohemia, who afterwards fell at Crécy, dreaming only of mighty deeds of arms, and caring little to be emperor, left the Germanic sceptre to the contention of two eager rivals, Frederick the Handsome and Louis of Bavaria. The former was a son of Albert of Austria, and was backed by his brothers and by powerful lords. Everything seemed to be against Louis, who was the youngest of the electoral house of Wittelsbach—even his eldest brother, Rudolph, Count Palatine of the Rhine. But he was brave and made many friends; he favored the Swiss cantons, which fought for him; soon the king of Bohemia declared for him, and finally the victory of Mühldorf (1322) ruined the Austrian party. Frederick and one of his brothers were prisoners; Louis V. (1314–1347), recognized as emperor, exercised all the imperial rights. All at once there appeared posted on the doors of the

church of Avignon a pontifical mandate prohibiting Louis from any act of authority until he had presented himself before the pope, that his election might be examined and his cause judged. This exaction of John XXII. was not without precedents, and was intended to prevent new wars; Louis of Bavaria himself did not decline the cognizance of a tribunal of peace. But affairs soon assumed another face. Turbulent spirits conjured up clouds. The pope excommunicated, then deposed, Louis; the latter, after a reconciliation with his rival, made him his colleague and passed into Italy, where he risked his cause by selling principalities, sanctioning usurpations, and creating an anti-pope (1327).

Louis of Bavaria, supported by his electors, for twenty years defied the thunders of Avignon, the leagues formed against him within Germany and without, and even the attacks of his old ally, King John of Bohemia, who, though now blind, had lost nothing of his warlike spirit. Being struck with apoplexy while hunting (1347), Louis V. left the field open to various aspirants. His family stood aside. Half a century later (1400) a Wittelsbach, Robert, the Count Palatine, great-grandnephew of Louis, claimed the imperial dignity and felt its grievous weight. Before and after Robert the princes of Luxembourg, descendants of Henry VII., were also unfortunate enough to wear the imperial crown.

THE GOLDEN BULL (1356); CHARLES IV. AND HIS TWO SONS (1349-1437).—One year before the death of Louis V. several electors had hurriedly enthroned Charles of Luxembourg, son of John the Blind. He was not recognized, however, until three

years later, when his competitors had retired. Charles IV. showed great deference to the court of Avignon and a distrust of the Italians, and this last was especially displayed in his reserve toward the Romans when he went to be crowned in their city, so long deserted by the popes ; he entered Rome in the garb of a pilgrim and remained but one day. It is not right to blame him because he loved his family, enriched his hereditary kingdom of Bohemia, endowed Prague, his capital, with superb palaces, an archiepiscopal see, and a flourishing university. Charles loved science and letters ; he encouraged the professors and their students by his presence at their lessons and theological tilts ; he also congratulated Petrarch, the great poet of the age. Still it must be admitted with the Germans that during his reign “the Germanic eagle lost many of its feathers.” The kingdom of Arles was severed from the empire for the emolument of the first dauphin of France (later King Charles V.), a nephew of the emperor. In Italy the regal rights were alienated. In Germany the “Golden Bull,” drawn up, it is said, by the Italian jurist Bartoli and promulgated by Charles IV. in the diet of Metz (1356), sanctioned the independence of the great vassals at the expense of the crown. The constitutive law called the “Golden Bull,” because every copy bore a golden seal, reduced the number of electors to seven—the three archbishops of Cologne, Mayence, and Treves, the king of Bohemia, the duke of Saxony, the margrave of Brandenburg, and the count palatine of the Rhine. The electoral territories were declared indivisible, the persons of the electors inviolable, their sentences irrevocable. They were to elect the emperor at Frankfort by plurality

of votes. Each of the electors received a pompous title of the function he was to perform at the coronation. They could convene without the consent of the prince, to resist, to judge, and to depose him.

Charles IV. was elector as king of Bohemia, his youngest son, Sigismund, as margrave of Brandenburg. To secure the empire to Wenceslaus, or Wenzel, his eldest son, the heir of Bohemia, Charles lavished one hundred thousand florins on the five other electors. Wenceslaus was made emperor, but he rendered himself so contemptible as to be deposed in accordance with the provisions of his father's "Golden Bull." Bohemia, that privileged land, but infected with heresy and bleeding with a savage war, might impute its woes to that very University of Prague which its founder had so royally favored. To such a pass had come the work of Charles IV.

Wenceslaus (1378–1400) earned an evil fame by having tolerated, and even sanctioned, private wars in Germany, displayed shameless licentiousness in Bohemia, martyred St. John Nepomuk (Nepomucen), and contributed to render this epoch one of the most lamentable in history. John Nepomuk, a learned canon of Prague, was the empress's confessor. In his folly Wenceslaus insisted that the holy priest should make known to him the most inviolable of secrets, and for this end employed promises, entreaties, and threats. The inflexible confessor was hurled from a bridge into the Moldau; but Heaven honored the martyr of the seal of confession by signal miracles (1393). Bohemia bore the yoke of a sottish and cruel king; but the electors of the empire could depose him, which four of them did (1400). They elected the palatine, Robert of Ba-

varia, who, beaten in Italy and ill-obeyed in Germany, died of grief (1410). After him there were three emperors instead of two : Wenceslaus, King-elector of Bohemia, had his vote and his party ; his brother Sigismund, Margrave-elector of Brandenburg and King of Hungary, had three votes ; their cousin-german, Josse of Moravia, had the remaining votes. At that very time there were likewise three popes. A fratricidal war was about to blaze out in Germany when Josse died. Wenceslaus transferred his rights to his brother, who then united all the suffrages (1411). Civil war was averted, but in its place there was a religious war.

WAR OF THE HUSSITES (1416-1434), TABORITES, AND CALIXTINES ; THE EMPEROR SIGISMUND (1411-1437).—Unity was restored to the empire in the person of Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, King of Hungary, and heir presumptive of Bohemia. Wholly different from his brother, he employed his great power to re-establish unity in the Church. He gave his aid to assembling the General Council of Constance, which healed the schism. But the punishment which the council, with the assent of Sigismund, inflicted on John Huss and Jerome of Prague aroused a deadly hatred amongst many of the Bohemians for the Church, the Germans, and particularly for the emperor. The sectaries openly preached heresy, despoiled the clergy, and impudently demanded communion under both kinds for the laity. Ziska the One-eyed, a veteran soldier and adventurer, led the heretics and organized them into battalions. They took position on a mountain near Prague, and there built a city which they called Tabor, styling themselves Taborites, in oppo-

sition to Catholics, who were Philistines, Idumeans, Moabites. They soon fell upon Prague ; the burgo-master and thirteen senators were thrown out of the castle windows and received on the upturned points of swords ; priests and monks were everywhere massacred, and more than five hundred and fifty churches were burned down. At this news Wenceslaus went mad, and died uttering yells of terror (1419). Sigismund was personally hated by the Taborites, so that his accession to the throne of Bohemia only redoubled their wrath. Ziska routed him at Deutschbrod. Then he offered the crown of Bohemia to King Jagellon of Poland ; but the latter, only just converted from paganism, repelled the heretic with horror. Ziska died soon after (1424). Discord then crept in amongst the sectaries. They split into four parties, the most fanatical of which maintained the doctrines of the Taborites and chose as leader Procopius Raza. He gained three great victories over the Catholic crusaders and the imperialists. The Council of Basle granted the use of the chalice to the most moderate of the Bohemians, and thus rallied them to the Catholic cause. These Calixtines, as they were called, took it upon themselves to vanquish their former brethren, which they did at Boehmisch-brod. "Only Bohemians can beat Bohemians," Sigismund had said. This horrible war was ended by the peace of Igau (1434).

Sigismund of Luxembourg barely survived this treaty. Although the last prince of his line, three present reigning families owe their fortune to him. He gave Saxony to Frederick the Warlike, scion of the electors and kings of Saxony. Brandenburg he ceded to Frederick of Hohenzollern, the ancestor of

the present emperor of Germany. He wedded his daughter to Albert V., the head of the House of Austria. Albert succeeded him in the thrones of Bohemia and Hungary (1437), and the following year received the imperial crown as Albert II. From that time the House of Austria has more or less happily held possession of the Germanic empire until the Seven Weeks' War (1866) in our own day.

**RETURN OF THE EMPIRE TO AUSTRIA.**—For one hundred and thirty years the hated memory of Albert I., the great-great-grandfather of Albert II., had excluded the dukes of Austria from the imperial throne and from the original possessions of the family in Switzerland. There they had sustained reverse upon reverse ; but a fortunate marriage had just given them more than adequate compensation. Such was to be the oft-repeated good-fortune of Austria, as expressed in the famous verses.\*

Albert II., the Magnanimous, resolutely opposed the private wars. Despite the reluctance of many, the German lords, in the diet of Nuremberg, at last sanctioned the division of the empire into six circuits, in each of which an independent and powerful judge was charged to maintain the public peace. The emperor was preparing to attack the Turks with his whole force when he died in the second year of his reign (1439). A few months later his posthumous son inherited his kingdom, but the empire fell to his cousin, Frederick III., who, in a long reign (1440-1493), effected more than one reform in Germany and secured the crown to his descendants.

\* *Bella gerant alii : tu, felix Austria, nube ;  
Nam, quæ Mars alii, dat tibi regna Venus.*

**Sec. 2. Liberation of Switzerland (1307–1450).**

ORIGIN OF SWITZERLAND ; OPPRESSION.—If we were to go back to the remotest origin of Switzerland, called Helvetia by the Romans, we should have to consider some of the peculiarities of its most ancient inhabitants, whose dwellings and towns were built in the midst of lakes and rested on piles. Many curious remains of these ancient “lake-dwellers” are constantly recovered from the waters. We should then be obliged to speak of the Helvetians, the Romans, the barbarians of the different empires, and the great feudatories who had swayed the country since the beginning of historic times. Switzerland’s history begins with the last epoch of the Middle Ages, at the great interregnum, when Suabia was broken up and the fiefs dismembered that had been united under the illustrious House of Hohenstaufen.

On the fall of that house (1268) all its vassals swore immediate fealty to the emperor. The ambitious counts of Würtemberg improved this freedom to extend their dominion in the north. In the region of lakes and wooded mountains which lies at the south, a host of petty lords, bishops, abbots, and a few imperial cities and forest cantons, jealously preserved their independence, saving the homage and slight tribute they paid the emperor, who was their only suzerain. Among these petty Swiss lords was the count of Hapsburg, Rudolph, whose virtues had caused him to be chosen magistrate by several of the neighboring lords and cities, and by the peasants of the three forest cantons of Schwytz, Uri, and Unterwalden. Raised to the empire, Rudolph continued

to respect the liberty of those who had been his clients. But times changed after his death. His son Albert, driven from the throne, was not satisfied with Austria; he persisted in regarding the clients of his family as subjects. On becoming emperor, and his projects of territorial aggrandizement failing in Bohemia, he turned to Switzerland. He sent bailiffs thither, and their vexatious measures incensed the Swiss, who clamored for their liberties and shook off the Austrian yoke.

But history has been unwillingly forced to leave to poesy the solemn and mysterious oath of Rutli; William Tell's shooting the apple placed on his son's head, and the piercing the heart of the tyrant Gessler by an arrow from the bow of the same skilful archer. But there is no doubt of the tragic death of Albert (1308), the cruel vengeance wreaked by his widow and sons, the league of the primitive cantons, and their heroic victories.

VICTORIES OF MORGARTEN (1315), SEMPACH (1386), AND NÆFELS (1389).—The Emperor Louis of Bavaria had sanctioned the league and guaranteed the liberties of the three forest cantons; the latter, in return, supported Louis against his rival, Frederick the Handsome, son of Albert of Austria. In revenge Frederick sent his brother, Leopold the Glorious, into Switzerland at the head of a noble army whose cavalry glittered with steel (1315). The Austrian warriors came supplied with ropes to bind the hapless peasants and drag them away captive from their country. Proudly the Austrians advanced, expecting no danger; they had already entered the defile of Morgarten, that opens into the canton of Schwytz, when lo! great masses of rock

came bounding and crashing down the sides of the gap amongst the cavalry, which gave way and carried disorder into the ranks of the infantry. Then the peasants, scrambling down from the heights, charged the enemy with their halberds and utterly overcame them. Though but thirteen hundred and fifty strong, they had, by fervent prayer, enlisted God on their side. Leopold hastened to make peace ; and the three forest cantons, with the sanction of the Emperor Louis, substituted a perpetual union for the league they had sworn at Brunnen seven years before.

Lucerne joined the league in 1332 ; Zurich, Glaris, and Zug in 1352 ; the following year the accession of Berne swelled the number to eight, which was not exceeded till after the close of mediæval times, when it reached thirteen, and in our days twenty-two. Switzerland derives its name from the canton of Schwytz, in which the battle of Morgarten was won, and which cemented the primitive confederation.

The dukes of Austria beheld with no little vexation the growth of a confederation which compromised their power in Switzerland, Suabia, and the Tyrol. At the same time the confederates took advantage of the difficulties which Wenceslaus of Bohemia was causing Austria by his connivance at the outrages of the Hussites. At last Leopold the Valiant, a nephew of the beaten general of Morgarten, summoned the nobility of Upper Germany to arms. Many lords responded to this summons and sent their challenges to the Swiss peasants. As soon as Leopold had assembled four thousand knights he opened the campaign by attacking fourteen hundred confederates near Sempach (Lucerne). The

knights on foot formed a square, presenting an impenetrable front of spears. The Swiss, badly armed, in vain attempted to break through. One of them cried out : “Follow me ; but look after my wife and children.” Then, rushing forward, he gathered the spears, and, pressing them together against his own breast, opened a passage into the square for his comrades. The Swiss rush in, and with their massive clubs make a horrible carnage among their enemies. Leopold and nearly seven hundred lords are slain ; the rest flee. The victors then bear away the mutilated corpse of their heroic comrade ; his name was Arnold Winkelried (1386).

Three years later another victory gained over the Austrians near the village of Næfels (Glaris) secured the independence of the confederation, and forced Duke Albert III. to sign the peace of Zurich (1389).

**TRIAL AND LIBERATION.**—Invincible while united against outside enemies, the eight cantons did not reflect that discord would recall danger and compromise their liberty. Ambition impelled Zurich to a conquest displeasing to Schwytz. The six other cantons having declared for Schwytz, Zurich made an alliance with Austria, which was then represented by Frederick III. (1442). The latter eagerly employed twenty-four thousand Armagnacs, commanded by the dauphin of France. These adventurers, inured to fighting, saw sixteen hundred Swiss boldly advancing to meet them, near Basle. The struggle began ; the Swiss held their ground before the immense mass, and, though hewn down almost to a man, would not give way (1444). The dauphin thought it wise to conclude a peace with so unquerable a people.

This was a warning to the Swiss ; they remained united against Charles the Bold, and still later against Maximilian. In less than sixty years (1453-1513) they gained rich spoils, brilliant trophies, and new strength by the accession of five other cantons.

**Sec. 3. Italy: Struggle of the Guelphs and Ghibelines ;  
Republics transformed into Principalities.**

**THE GUELPHI PROJECT ; GIBELLINE OPPOSITION ;  
THE SICILIAN VESPERS (1282).**—To withdraw Italy from a foreign yoke while acknowledging an honorary dependence upon the empire, to leave their privileges to every state, city, and class of citizens, was the truly national project of the Italian Guelphs in the thirteenth century, particularly during the long interregnum. Their sworn hatred of Frederick II. and the extinction of his race in Conradin were favorable to the policy of the young republics, the Pontifical States, and to Charles of Anjou. This latter had become king of Naples and Sicily after his defeat of Manfred, and was the head of the Guelph party in Italy. His influence was very great, and was felt in the cities of Tuscany, which were all Guelph excepting Pisa. He had numerous adherents in the north, as the family of Della Torre at Milan, the marquis of Este at Ferrara, and the Venetian merchants themselves in their lagunes. Nevertheless, there were everywhere Italians who could not submit to the dominion of a foreign power in Italy, among these Matteo Visconti of Milan, the Spinolas and the Dorias of Genoa, the marquis of Montferrat in Piedmont, and the White Guelphs at Florence.

Pope Gregory X. tried to reconcile the two parties ; and when Rudolph of Hapsburg appeared so generous in his relations with him, the saintly pontiff thought the moment come for the formation of a great confederation of the Italian States under the presidency of the popes and the temporal direction of an imperial delegate. Such a plan would have secured the welfare of the peninsula, but it was not to be realized.

Charles of Anjou, charged with the vicegerency in Central Italy, was hard and selfish, and detested for his cruelty even in his own dominions. John of Procida, formerly Manfred's physician, had been present at the execution of Conradin, when, picking up the young prince's glove, he swore to avenge the Hohenstaufens in the blood of their enemies. He conspired with Pedro of Aragon, who claimed the throne of Naples on account of his marriage to the daughter and heiress of Manfred, and then returned to Sicily, laid his plans with the most profound secrecy, and bided his time. On Easter Monday, 1282, at the sound of the vesper-bell, the signal was given near Palermo ; the Sicilians fell upon the king's men, upon all who mispronounced the word *ciceri*—that is, upon all the French. One only was spared on account of his virtues. This massacre is known as the Sicilian Vespers. On learning the frightful news Charles was thunderstruck. “O God !” he cried, “since you have raised me so suddenly, let me fall only by degrees.” He undertook to wreak vengeance on the Sicilians, and was supported by the pope, but Pedro of Aragon entered the Sicilian waters and braved excommunication. Charles's fleet was burnt by the great Italian admiral, Roger di Loria, his son

taken, and he himself died without his vengeance (1285).

The Ghibeline party's triumph was not confined to Sicily. For five years the Viscontis ruled in Milan. William of Montferrat extended his dominion in Liguria. The lords again raised their heads. Pisa threatened Florence and attempted to subdue all Sardinia. But Genoa, in concert with Florence, humbled the Ghibeline city by blocking up its port and destroying its fleet at Meloria (1284). This was the beginning of a Guelph reaction.

REACTION OF THE GUELPHS ; ROBERT OF ANJOU (1309-1343).—The triumph of the Ghibelines was again disturbed by the momentary expulsion of the Viscontis, by the arrival of Charles of Valois in Italy, and by the conflict of parties in Florence. So much had the Florentines learned to distrust their nobles that no function was confided to them until they had been admitted to the honor of the plebeian order ! Certain Guelphs who leaned to the Ghibelines were equally distrusted. These White Ghibelines, as they were called, were soon banished.

Other events favored the Guelphs. Pedro of Aragon, being called to the throne of his country, restored Sicily to Charles ; but the Sicilians, resenting the former cruelty of the French, crowned Frederick, third son of Pedro. James, the second son of Pedro, declared war against his brother. Frederick, however, would not be driven out of Sicily, where his posterity continued to reign for a century.

The passage of Henry VII. through Italy (1310) compromised the influence of the Guelphs in certain respects. Matteo Visconti, the "captain of the people," returned to Milan in triumph. Castruccio

Castracani, a famous captain, turned Lucca, his native place, into a constant menace for the neighboring Guelph cities. At Verona, Cane della Scala, a great soldier, protected artists, poets, and exiles. Dante Alighieri sought refuge with him, like other illustrious Florentines banished on account of their political opinions. The Guelphs, however, soon recovered their strength.

Charles II. dying, his second son, Robert, was proclaimed king, to the exclusion of the older branch which reigned in Hungary. The popes were residing in France, and appointed the king of Naples imperial vicar in the States of the Church. With this title Robert not only exercised the temporal power in Rome but the right of protection throughout Central Italy. He resolved to take advantage of his unusual authority to recover Sicily, but he was foiled ; the Sicilians were too brave, the Aragonian princes too firm, and Robert too little of a warrior. Yet it must be said in favor of this king that he governed his states and those of the pope wisely, and he was an enlightened patron of the arts and of men of genius. At this time the poet Petrarch underwent a brilliant examination and was awarded the honors of a triumph ; he was then conducted to the Capitol and received the laurel crown from the Senate of the Eternal City.

The unfortunate expedition of the Emperor Louis V. to Rome, and the pacific intervention of John of Bohemia in Upper Italy, scarcely impaired the influence of King Robert.

VIOLENT RETALIATION OF THE GHIBELINES ; THE VISCONTIS.—Upon the death of Robert his granddaughter Joanna was crowned queen of Naples. She

was the widow of her cousin, Andrew of Hungary, whose assassination was publicly charged to her. Her conduct and the struggles of rivals for the throne plunged the kingdom into an abyss of woes for forty years.

In the centre and north of Italy excessive license aroused tyranny or brought on despotism. The wisdom and firmness of the great Cardinal Albornoz saved Rome from the application of Rienzi's utopian ideas. But in Lombardy, on the other hand, the two Viscontis, Barnabò and Galeazzo, were ignoble tyrants. Galeazzo, before entering Pavia, which surrendered to him, swore to observe the articles of capitulation, but, once in, declared himself, as an imperial delegate, bound by nothing; hence he exiled, he put to death, he imprisoned. His brother Barnabò (1355–1385) regulated the punishment of state crimes as follows: “The executioner shall begin by breaking the bones of the criminal, tearing the skin from his feet, making him drink water mixed with lime and vinegar; then every two days successively the criminal's nose, hands, and feet shall be cut off; not till the forty-first day shall the red-hot pincers be employed, and, if necessary, he shall be despatched by the rack.” Could it be a state crime to resist such a monster? To slay a wild boar was punishable with death by strangulation, unless, indeed, an exorbitant fine was paid. In this way many of the potentates ruled their dominions. A crusade was preached against Galeazzo Visconti, and at last he and his two sons were caught in a snare laid by his nephew Gian Galeazzo. The latter then purchased the title of duke from the Emperor Wenceslaus, and governed Milan (1385–1402) according to the usual

policy of the Visconti family, which was always distinguished for its opposition to French influence in Italy. The Viscontis appropriated Parma and expelled the Guelph chief Giberto Correggio and his adherents ; they drove the followers of the family of Della Scala from Verona ; they annihilated the republic of Pavia. But they were checked in the west by John Palaeologus, Marquis of Montferrat, and in the east by the family of Este, lords of Ferrara, the Gonzagas of Mantua, and by the republic of Venice, which was gaining territory on the mainland. Nothing was yet heard in Italy of the great House of Savoy, although it already had a foothold on the Italian side of the mountains, and only awaited a favorable opportunity of taking part in the civil wars that for so long a time devastated the beautiful land of Italy.

**RIVALRY OF MARITIME CITIES ; ASCENDENCY OF VENICE.**—The Crusades, by increasing commercial relations between the different parts of the Mediterranean, had enriched several maritime cities of Italy, especially Pisa, Genoa, Venice. The Ghibeline Pisa was very prosperous in the middle of the thirteenth century, and roused the jealousy of her neighbor, Florence, and her rival, Genoa. A single battle sufficed to ruin her navy and to decimate her population. “If you would see Pisa, go to Genoa,” was the saying after the defeat of Meloria. Genoa, now having no rival in the waters of the West, extended her sway among the ports of the Levant, where she possessed Galata, a suburb of Constantinople ; Kaffa, which she bought from the khans of the Crimea ; and Azof, north of the Black Sea. The fall of the Latin empire and the restoration of the Greeks at

Byzantium had equally favored Genoa and injured Venice. The first war of twenty-five years (1257–1282) armed these two rival cities against one another and caused irreparable loss to both. The following century a war between the two cities opened on the Black Sea (1348), and became terrible in the three closing years (1379–1382). Genoa occupied the isles of Mitylene (Lesbos) and Chios (Scio) in the Archipelago, and the fortress of Famagusta in Cyprus; she assisted the Greek emperors and formed a coalition against Venice. The latter's allies attacked Genoa by land, while a Venetian fleet swept the Genoese off the Tyrrhenian Sea. However, the two brothers Paganino and Lucian Doria soon collected a formidable squadron, entered the Adriatic, and challenged the Venetian admiral, Pisani, in the roadstead of Pola. Both sides fought desperately. The Genoese admiral, Lucian Doria, was slain by Pisani; but this mishap did not prevent the Genoese from gaining a signal victory. The Venetians revenged their defeat on the brave Pisani, whom they threw into a dungeon.

Owing to this ill-advised revenge of the Venetians the new Genoese admiral, Pietro Doria, seized all the coast and sailed for Venice, which he besieged by posting himself at Chioggia, at the entrance of the lagunes, while his ally, Francis Carrara, lord of Padua, furrowed the lagunes with light barks. Venice was lost had her enemies been more on the alert. This delay gave the Venetians time to release Pisani, who was not dismayed at the posture of affairs. After a solemn Mass Pisani again set afloat several shattered vessels, encouraged his countrymen, and, sailing out into the open sea, besieged the Genoese in

Chioggia, secured the entrance of the lagunes, and so hampered the enemy that they fell a prey to the horrors of famine. The Genoese finally surrendered (1380) at discretion, with nineteen galleys and more than four thousand men. The treaty of Turin secured the ascendancy of Venice (1382).

Genoa, rent by its factions, frequently succumbed for a time to the rule of some lord, but no one could be found able to keep her in subjection. Charles VI. of France sent her the brave Marshal Boucicaut, but she soon grew weary of him and expelled him. Venice, on the contrary, yearly strengthened her aristocratic government ; the doge became at last no more than a mere clerk of the great council, especially after the failure of the doge Marino Faliero in his revolutionary attempt (1355), which ended by his head rolling down the Giant's Staircase. The great council was then directed by ten nobles, and this Council of Ten was itself mysteriously watched over by three among them who had absolute power of life and death over all the citizens, and even their colleagues. These were the Three State Inquisitors. With so powerful a mainspring despotic Venice extended her sway along the coasts and among the islands ; she gained a foothold, too, on the mainland, and was checked only by the enterprising dukes of Milan.

**EXTINCTION OF THE REPUBLICS ; ITALIAN PRINCIPALITIES.**—Florence long remained the bulwark of the Guelphs, a democratic republic, and the friend of arts and manufactures. But in the fifteenth century she let herself fall into the control of a family which had earned its great wealth by commerce. The Medici really reigned over the Florentines, and con-

sequently over the Tuscans. The Gonzagas were unnoticed at the foot of the mountains, as also the counts of Savoy, who were continually encroaching on Montferrat. The death of Gian Galeazzo Visconti did not restore liberty to Milan. The two sons of this duke succeeded him with diverse fortunes. The younger dying without heirs, Milan expressed a desire for republican government, but one of the three foreign claimants for the ducal crown, Francesco Sforza, with the help of the Venetians, had himself made duke (1450). Under the Sforza family the great Lombard city remained a principality. Rome herself was threatened in her temporal independence by the Neapolitans.

During this period Italy presents many scenes of horror, particularly the southern part, which was the most subject to foreign influences. During the hundred years following the death of Robert the Wise (1343–1443) occurred the scandals of Joanna I., the cruelties and pettiness of Charles III., the tyrannical puerilities of Ladislaus, and the political inconstancy of his sister, Joanna II. Much of the misery to which Italy was a prey at this time may be attributed to the want of combination among her independent states. Monarchy was brought into disrepute by the shameful lives, the cowardice, and cruelty of its representatives. It was reserved to the unfortunate kingdom of Sicily to restore monarchical unity as it had existed in the time of the Norman kings. The Aragonese branch of Sicily had been reunited to the eldest branch of Aragon by a marriage. All the family inheritance having fallen to Ferdinand of Castile (1412), his eldest son, Alfonso the Magnanimous, was adopted by Joanna II.

of Naples. He valiantly sustained his adoption, and transmitted the Two Sicilies to his son Ferdinand (1458).

Italy then was, at the close of the mediæval and opening of the modern age, divided into independent principalities, and every vestige of republics, Guelphs, and federative projects had vanished. But on the news of the taking of Constantinople by the Turks Pope Nicholas V. brought about the treaty of Lodi, in which appeared the germ of a defensive federation. But what is most glaring in this treaty is the diversity of interests, the suspicious jealousy and insatiable ambition by which the Italian princes sacrificed the interests of the people and of the entire country to their own emolument. In the centre of the petty states the patrimony of St. Peter, which best preserved the republican ideas of the early Italian states, was the least exposed to the attacks of the neighboring princes, and thus the Papacy enjoyed full independence.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### SPAIN—THE FIVE KINGDOMS.

This period is an unbroken series of intestine quarrels and struggles among the kingdoms. There is, however, a visible tendency towards unity in Spain, and the lofty destiny of Portugal rapidly becomes apparent.

RESPECTIVE SITUATION OF THE FIVE KINGDOMS OF THE PENINSULA.—On the north the little kingdom of Navarre, seated on both slopes of the western Pyrenees, seemed doomed to oblivion amidst

the great kingdoms that bounded it, or to become the inheritance of some foreign sovereign. On the extinction of the national dynasty of Aznar (1234) the house of the counts of Champagne had been called by a matrimonial alliance to wear the crown of Navarre. Forty years later another marriage transmitted this crown to the royal family of France. Thus Philip the Fair and his three sons were kings of France and Navarre (1274–1328). The Capetian branch of Evreux then inherited the throne, only to dishonor it under Charles the Bad (1349–1386) and to enhance it under Charles the Noble (1386–1425). The latter, unlike his father, left a wife his heiress, whose rights passed to two Aragonese princes, father and son, who disputed the kingdom by force of arms (1451). During this period the history of Navarre blends with that of France.

At the foot of the eastern Pyrenees the kings of Aragon, hemmed in by powerful neighbors, at an early date braved the waves, not even recoiling at crimes when useful in their conquests of the Mediterranean islands. They profited by the Sicilian Vespers to extend their power. Soon the violent annexation of the Balearic Isles, and repeated attempts upon Sardinia, Corsica, and Naples, enlarged the Aragonese possessions.

Portugal engaged in agriculture, maritime conquest, and the study of letters and sciences under King Diniz (1279–1325), the husband of St. Elizabeth of Aragon. Recently enlarged on the southward by the conquest of Algarve, the kingdom also attained limits on the east which its enemies have not been able to vary. This country was destined by Providence to explore the Atlantic, little by little to

reconnoitre the African coast as far as the Cape of Good Hope, and thereby to open the route of the East Indies to navigators and missionaries.

In Andalusia, at the southeast of the peninsula, the reduced kingdom of Granada was all that remained to the Mohammedans of their former Spanish possessions. Surrounded by strongholds and Castilian garrisons, the kings of Granada could not have held out in that fair land till 1492 had it not been for succor from Africa and the unfortunate dissensions which at that time prevailed over most of Christian Europe, and was rending the Christian kingdom of Spain, especially Castile.

**CASTILE ; WEAKNESS OF ROYALTY ; ALFONSO XI. (1312–1350).**—By his inherited possessions and conquests St. Ferdinand had secured to Castile the greater part of Spain, considerable revenues, and ports on all the coasts. But his son, Alfonso X., the Wise (1252–1284), aimed at the empire of Germany. He was a learned man, and we are indebted to him for the valuable astronomical Alphonsine Tables ; but he had not the requisite faculties for governing a turbulent country. In fact, he produced so much discontent that the people, grandees, and princes of the blood resolved to depose him. To maintain his cause he asked aid of the Moors. Sancho the Brave, his second son, by ascending the throne (1284) against the rights of the *infantes* of la Cerda, the children of the eldest, involved himself in war with France at the very time when he had to repel the Moors of Granada, who had made a coalition with the Merinides of Morocco. Sancho triumphed over all his enemies, but his untimely death and the minority of his son again plunged Spain into the

calamities of civil war. The young king, on attaining his majority, suddenly died (1312), leaving his crown to Alfonso XI., a child three years old. Troubles began again ; the grandes enriched themselves at the expense of the king, and the Moors recovered some of the ground they had lost.

At fourteen Alfonso eagerly seized the reins of state, ordered the massacre of several princes, entrusted his finances to a Jew and everything else to two favorites. Fresh revolts were about to break out when a formidable invasion of the Merinides, instigated by Yusef, King of Granada, summoned the Castilian lords to Tarifa. There they firmly withstood the Mussulmans till the arrival of Alfonso and the king of Portugal, who hastened at the head of their armies, accompanied by many warriors from Aragon, Navarre, and France (1340). Perceiving this brilliant army descending in perfect order towards the Rio Salado, the besiegers advanced to hinder it from crossing, but the Christians, swimming over, attacked the van of the enemy, while the garrison of Tarifa attacked the rear. The camp of the Merinides was carried by assault, and their king escaped to Africa. The infidels were everywhere routed, pursued, and it is said that two hundred thousand of them were slain, while the Christian army lost but twenty-five men ! The Castilian king would have derived greater advantage from this victory had he not returned to his disorders and his burdensome taxes. He contented himself with the capture of Algeziras, and perished under the walls of Gibraltar (1350).

PEDRO THE CRUEL (1350-1369) AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES ; IÑEZ DE CASTRO AND PEDRO THE

**JUST** (1357–1367).—Alfonso XI. left ten children by his clandestine union with Leonora Guzman ; the eldest was Henry of Transtamare. The only legitimate son of the king was Pedro the Cruel, a veritable monster, who disgraced the throne by his incontinence, exactions, perfidy, and unheard-of cruelties. These cruelties were inflicted on private individuals, cities, princes of the blood, on Leonora Guzman, on a queen of Aragon in retirement at Castile, and on his innocent wife, Blanche de Bourbon. A prince of Granada, who had thrown himself on his clemency, saw the heads of seventeen of his attendants roll from their shoulders before he himself received his death-blow from the king's hand. A son who implored mercy for his aged father suffered death in return for his devotion. Vengeance finally descended upon his guilty head ; the Black Prince having deserted Pedro, Du Guesclin contented himself with confronting the latter with his brother, Henry of Transtamare, who speedily avenged his mother, his four brothers, the princes, princesses, and all Castile, of which he became king (1369).

By an unfortunate coincidence the cruel king of Castile was surrounded by kings resembling himself. In Navarre Charles II. was justly branded with the surname Bad (1349–1386) ; in Aragon Pedro IV. deserved rather to be called the Cruel than the Ceremonious. During a reign of fifty-one years (1336–1387) the latter king violently wrested Minorca from a near kinsman and put him to death ; his own brothers he exiled, delivered up his venerable tutor to the executioner, and would have slain his eldest son but for the veto of the supreme judge of Aragon. His troubled reign was a forerunner of ruin to his race,

which became extinct in Spain and Sicily with one of his sons (1410).

In Portugal Affonso IV. (1325–1357), one of the victors on the Salado, having given ear to three miserable courtiers, had ordered Iñez de Castro, who was secretly married to the Infante Pedro, to be poniarded (1355). The latter, immediately revolting against his father, harshly reminded him that he too had rebelled against his own father, Diniz the Husbandman, and Father of his Country. Affonso died of grief. Pedro, on becoming king (1357), caused the hearts of the three murderers to be torn out before his eyes, producing at the same time certificates of his marriage with Iñez; then he exhumed the corpse of their victim, clothed it with royal robes, and laid it in the sepulchre of kings. This act of rigorous justice was followed by another very different in appearance, but not so in reality. A canon, having unintentionally killed a shoemaker, was condemned by his judges to exclusion from choir for one year. The shoemaker's son, thinking himself inadequately revenged, slew the canon. The king condemned the culprit not to make shoes for a whole year. The lesson was understood by the judges: they spared innocence, but were inexorable towards criminals, whoever they might be. Hence the avenger of Iñez is called Pedro the Just.

HOUSE OF TRANSTAMARE IN CASTILE (1369), IN ARAGON (1412), IN NAVARRE (1451).—Pedro the Cruel being dead, Henry II. of Transtamare was acknowledged king by all the Castilians, but he was forced to defend his throne against a king of Portugal, a grandson of Alfonso XI., and against the dukes of Lancaster and York, who were sons-in-law

of Pedro. Henry strengthened himself with the support of France, secured ten years of happiness to his subjects, and merited the surname of the Magnificent (1369–1379). Juan I., his son, worsted the English in Guienne and the duke of Lancaster in Spain, but was himself defeated and nearly slain by the Portuguese on the day of Aljubarrota (1385). The domestic troubles of Castile, increased by this defeat, by the unexpected death of King Juan, and by the minority of his son Henry III. (1390–1406), were partially allayed when the latter came to his majority. Unfortunately he died when only twenty-six, leaving his son, Juan II. (1406–1454), only one year old, as successor. The cortes (parliament) offered the crown to Henry's brother, Prince Ferdinand. "Behold your king and mine," said he to the deputies, pointing to his nephew's cradle ; "I am his guardian." In this capacity he gained two brilliant victories over the Mohammedans of Granada. Being called, on account of his virtues, to the vacant throne of Aragon, Ferdinand the Just transferred the regency of Castile to the queen mother, an Englishwoman. She was given to drunkenness, and while she treated with the Moors she kept her son in such seclusion as to render him for ever incapable of reigning alone, so that the long reign of Juan II. was rather the reign of his favorite, Alvaro de Luna, a man of energy, who interposed as occasion required in the tumults arising among the Mussulmans against the Abencerrages (Beni Serraj). He defeated Mohammed VII. on the Fig-tree Plain under the very walls of Granada. Despite the league of the grandes, the intrigues of the prince royal of the Asturias, the menaces of the neighboring kings, Alvaro retained the power for

thirty years till the day on which his master, giving way before the storm, sent him to execution. Mounting the scaffold, he cried out : “ May the prince of the Asturias reward his faithful servants better than his father does ! ” So saying, he respectfully bowed to the cross and presented his head to the axe (1453). By this stroke the feeble monarch broke his own sceptre and died of grief the year following. Castile was to be still more unfortunate under his incapable son, Henry IV. ; but his daughter was to retrieve the blunders of her brother and the weakness of her father. She is known as Isabella the Catholic.

The dynasty of Aragon becoming extinct with King Martin (1410), nine deputies of the provinces met at Saragossa to choose a king from the numerous aspirants. Having deliberated two years, the electors, following the counsel of the great preacher and wonder-worker, St. Vincent Ferrer, their countryman, agreed to elect Ferdinand of Castile, the disinterested regent who had so inviolably guarded the rights of his nephew still in the cradle. Ferdinand the Just reigned in peace over Aragon, Sardinia, and Sicily (1412–1416). He was succeeded by his son, Alfonso V., the Magnanimous (1416–1458), who became king of Naples also, both by right of adoption and by conquest. Juan, younger son of Ferdinand, by wedding the daughter of Charles the Noble (1425), ascended the throne of Navarre, which he refused to vacate on the death of his wife (1451). He soon inherited, as Juan II., the dominions of his brother Alfonso, who had no legitimate offspring. At his death (1479) he transmitted his crowns to his youngest son, Ferdinand the Catholic, already king of Castile by his marriage with Isabella. The son of Juan II. of Ara-

gon and the daughter of Juan II. of Castile, being united, were also to unite Spain into one kingdom, crush the Mussulman power of Granada, and aid Christopher Columbus to discover the New World (1492).

HOUSE OF AVISA IN PORTUGAL; JOHN I. (1383–1433) AND THE INFANTE HENRY; AFFONSO THE AFRICAN (1438–1481).—Pedro the Just had left but one son of uncontested legitimacy, and he succeeded his father. This son dying without male issue, John, the grand master of Avisa, one of Pedro's other sons, adroitly had himself proclaimed king by the cortes of Coimbra (1383). In the following year the crown was secured to him against the claims of Castile by the victory of Aljubarrota, whose anniversary the Portuguese long celebrated with bacchanalian revelry. John of Avisa, in turn, broached his claims on Castile, but this was only to secure his own recognition and to trace the boundary between the two countries. This prince clearly understood the destiny of Portugal. Ceuta, on the African coast, served as a refuge for Mussulman corsairs. The king of Portugal embarked with his three elder sons, took the place in six days, and, in a mosque transformed into a church, he dubbed his three sons knights (1415).

One of these was Henry, grand master of the Order of Christ, under which denomination King Diniz had preserved the Templars of Portugal after reforming them. Possessing rich revenues, unshackled by marriage, and ardently zealous for the glory of his country, Henry withdrew to the coast of Algarve, near Cape St. Vincent. There he built an observatory and a residence for himself and his

mathematicians, and founded a nautical academy. Thence vessels sailed for the discovery of unexplored coasts and unknown islands, and returned laden with novel commodities or enriched with the most important discoveries and information. The Infante munificently rewarded navigators. His ardor was stimulated by Jean de Béthencourt, a Norman nobleman, who had discovered the Canaries (1402) and had been appointed viceroy over them by Henry III. of Castile. The Portuguese navigators, in their turn, discovered the Madeira Islands (1418), the distant Azores (1432), and all the African coast as far as Sierra Leone. King John I. lived to enjoy the maritime success of his son; he died only after a reign of fifty years (1433). Henry survived him thirty years, prosecuting his patriotic enterprises under his brother Edward and his nephew, Affonso V. The latter passed over to Africa to effect conquests and permanent settlements, to promote his uncle's work, and thus to merit the glorious surname of African. The reign of Affonso V. (1438-1481) laid the foundation of prosperity for the three following reigns (John II., Emmanuel, John III.), the expedition of Gama, immortalized by an epic poem, and the great apostolate of St. Francis Xavier.

## CHAPTER V.

## SCANDINAVIA AND THE SLAVIC COUNTRIES.

Northward three Scandinavian nations attempt to increase their real greatness by union. Eastward, while the Russians remain slaves of the Mongols, the Poles, united to the baptized Lithuanians, become powerful, and the Hungarians defend themselves against the Turks, who enthrall the other Slavs of the Danube.

**Sec. 1. The Three Scandinavian Kingdoms ; Margaret (1363–1412) and the Union of Calmar.**

**EXTINCTION OF THE THREE ROYAL FAMILIES.—**  
One of the most important events of this period is unquestionably the reunion of the three northern crowns on the head of one monarch. This event, naturally brought about by the extinction of the reigning dynasties, and accomplished by a woman of genius, would have resulted in immense advantages to all Scandinavians for a long while, if the weakness and vices of men had not set up obstacles.

Norway, then at the summit of prosperity, was the first to witness the extinction of its national dynasty. Magnus VII., the Lawgiver (1263–1280), was succeeded by his two sons ; at the death of the youngest (1319) there remained but daughters. According to a law common to all the Scandinavians, princesses could not inherit the crown, but could transmit it to a son. In virtue of this law a daughter of the last Norwegian king, having married a Swedish prince, had her son, Magnus VIII., proclaimed king of Norway. He was a child three years old, who had just mounted the throne of Sweden.

Thus the Swedish dynasty of the Folkungs took possession of two thrones. It was about to inherit a third, only to become extinct soon after. Magnus VIII., having attained his majority, governed his two kingdoms with severity. His discontented subjects compelled him to share his power with his sons ; Haco VII. reigned in Norway, Eric XII. in Sweden. The untimely death of the latter restored to Magnus an authority of which the Swedes were soon tired ; they imprisoned their king, and offered his crown first to his son, Haco, King of Norway, and almost immediately afterwards to his nephew, Albert of Mecklenburg. Leaving the Swedes to their fickleness, Haco consoled himself by marrying (1363) Margaret, daughter of Waldemar III., King of Denmark.

During a century and a half Denmark was in great agony. It had mighty neighbors and vicious or weak sovereigns ; it was a prey to revolutions ; finally, royalty died out in an interregnum of fourteen years (1326–1340). Waldemar III. (1340–1375) might have remedied these evils. He was brave and just, but he was at the same time hasty, inconstant, and easily discouraged. He undertook several wars, concluded treaties, travelled, and yet at his death left the kingdom almost as it was at his accession. He was the last descendant of Estrita, the sister of Canute the Great. The honor of retrieving the throne of Denmark was reserved to Margaret, the younger of Waldemar's two daughters.

MARGARET, THE SEMIRAMIS OF THE NORTH (1363–1412).—The male posterity of their kings being extinct, the Danes offered the crown to young Olaf, the son of Margaret and Haco (1375). Haco, dying

five years after, left his son the crown of Norway and his legitimate claims to the crown of Sweden, of which he was heir apparent. A boy of ten years was incapable of enforcing his rights or of governing alone ; but his mother was near him, relieving the people, checking the great, availing herself of the influence of the clergy, and reforming abuses with equal tact and firmness. The blessings she had brought Norway in her husband's name she extended to Denmark in that of her son. But the latter died at the age of seventeen (1387), and with him expired the last royal family of Scandinavia.

The great qualities of Margaret would be lost to the nation unless existing laws should be modified. This Denmark and Norway understood ; hence they entreated the princess to retain the supreme authority, and to rear the new king. Conformably to these views she called to the court her sister's grandson, Eric the Pomeranian, then but five years old. Eric was acknowledged, the queen educated him as her son, and did all in her power to prepare for him a brilliant reign. Sweden, oppressed by Albert, was casting envious glances on the two neighboring kingdoms ; the imprudent Mecklenburger increased the discontent by ridiculing the piety of Margaret, sending her a whetstone to sharpen her scissors, and by assuming the title of king of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. Having, at great cost, raised an army, he one day swore not to put on his cap till he had conquered Margaret. The latter, nothing daunted, put a renowned general over her troops and won a signal victory at Falkjoping. Albert, being taken prisoner, was reminded of his oath by the present of a long woollen cap ; he was

consigned to a fortress, and Sweden, with the exception of several castles, surrendered to the queen (1389).

UNION OF CALMAR (1397).—Having let the Swedes relish for several years the sweets of her administration, the illustrious daughter of Waldemar resolved to carry out a long-studied project. Convoking the deputies of the three kingdoms at Calmar, in Sweden, she caused Eric to be solemnly crowned by the bishops, created one hundred and thirty-three knights chosen from each country, and delivered a discourse in which, adoring the Providence which had permitted the extinction of the three royal races, she expatiated on the advantages to accrue from the union of the three kingdoms. “ You will enjoy,” she said, “ unalterable peace and great commercial prosperity; you will behold all the forces of the North turned against the enemy, the Hanseatic League deprived of its monopoly, the Baltic and the Atlantic open to the Scandinavians.” This called forth loud applause and gained all the votes. It was agreed to unite the three kingdoms, in perpetuity, under the sceptre of one monarch, who should successively visit each kingdom, hear complaints of his subjects, and appoint the higher magistrates; each country was to retain its laws and liberties, but in case one should be attacked by the enemy the others should come to its defence. Six copies of this covenant were written out on parchment, to which were affixed the seals of the king and queen, of all the deputies, of the Metropolitans of Upsal, of Lund, of Drontheim. So beautiful a conception, realized without convulsion, solely by persuasion at an opportune moment, shows Margaret to have been a woman

of lofty genius, disinterested patriotism, and a clear perception of the part which Catholic Scandinavians would have enacted had they not again split into petty kingdoms and then fallen a prey to heresy. Hence in the history of the North the foundress of the Union stands alone ; her charitable institutions, her sincere piety and sterling virtues, have gained her the respect even of Protestant writers, who honor her by styling her the “ Semiramis of the North.”

Margaret survived the consummation of the Scandinavian Union fifteen years, exterminated pirates, and removed all the difficulties that might trammel Eric’s government. Unfortunately the latter had not his aunt’s virtues ; this soon became apparent, particularly in Sweden, where the unpunished excesses of a royal lieutenant roused the indignation of the peasants (1433). A Dalecarlian nobleman named Engelbrecht made himself the champion and avenger of the oppressed. Perhaps he would have sustained till the end the hypocritical part which Gustavus Vasa played in the following century had he not been assassinated either with the connivance or by the orders of Charles Canutson, an ambitious noble who resolved at any cost to ascend the throne of Sweden. By reviving the Union of Calmar the king regained his authority, but he again lost it by his eccentricities, particularly by his obstinate retirement in an island of the Baltic (1439). His nephew, Christopher the Bavarian, brought back concord for a time, but death snatched him away, and Canutson imposed himself on Sweden, and even upon Norway. His odious tyranny soon rendered him insupportable. The virtuous Christian I. of Oldenburg (1448–1481), being elected by the Danes, and acknowledged by the Nor-

wegians and the majority of the Swedes, patiently waited till his rival was wholly unpopular before re-establishing the Scandinavian monarchy and the Union of Calmar (1458).

## Sec. 2. The Slavs in Servitude, except the Poles and Hungarians.

**THE RUSSIANS ENTHRALLED BY THE GOLDEN HORDE.**—We have seen the Russians, after their brilliant appearance in the third period, beginning to separate in the fourth from Catholic unity. After weakening themselves by internecine wars they were more easily trodden under foot by the Mongols. During the fifth period their thraldom continued. The grand duke of Russia, at his accession, still went to the Golden Horde in its capital of Kaptchak, and there paid tribute, and on his knees received his investiture from the Tartar khan. The latter claimed the right of deposing his vassal, or even of putting him to death, in case he should be wanting in deference. The terrible Uzbek, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, caused two grand dukes to be slain before his eyes and deposed two others. At the end of the preceding century Nogaï, a Mongol leader, having rendered himself independent of the khan, long exacted from the Russian princes a second homage and exorbitant tributes. Thus the hapless successors of Rurik and their subjects gradually sank to the lowest level of moral degradation. Dmitri IV., a founder of Moscow, elated by some successes, crossed the Don with a Russian army (1380). He decimated the Kaptchak army, but so weakened his own that it could not withstand the lieu-

tenants of Timur, nor the ferocious conqueror in person, nor even the Lithuanians. At the end of this period we see Vasili (Basil) III. (1425–1462) driven out by his uncle, and then recalled ; taken by the Tartars and ransomed ; deprived of sight by a rebel, yet continuing to reign till the ill-advised partition of his dominions among his five sons. Four centuries of discord and oppression had not yet corrected the Russian princes. The expulsion of the metropolitan Isidore, who returned a Catholic from the General Council of Florence, proved this nation to be more schismatic than ever. It well deserved to have at once an absolute lord and master in Ivan III. (1462–1505), who refused tribute to the Mongols, but founded Muscovite autocracy upon the ruins of every princely, popular, and religious liberty. About this time the first bands of Cossacks were formed (1444).

HUMILIATION OF THE SLAVS.—On both banks of the Lower Danube arose the kingdom of Bulgaria in the thirteenth century. In the fourteenth Servia acquired ascendancy over Bulgaria, Macedon, and Albania through the talents of Stephen Dushan (1333–1356), who took the title of emperor of the Servians, Albanians, and Greeks. These countries and a few others had repulsed the Mongols and shaken off the yoke of the Hungarian kings and the Byzantine Cæsars ; but they still remained involved in the Greek schism. Before the end of the century the Ottoman Turks were to chastise them and effect what the Mongols of Kaptehak had done in Russia.

Hungary and Poland were long in recovering from the Mongol invasion. Each suffered from intestine dissensions and underwent a long dynastic crisis.

Two bulwarks at the portals of Europe were needed to stay the twofold scourge of Greek schism and barbarian invasion. In Hungary and Poland there was Catholic vitality to furnish defenders of the faith and, as occasion required, heroes.

POLAND ; CASIMIR THE GREAT (1333-1370) ; CONVERSION OF THE LITHUANIANS ; JAGELLON (1386-1434).—For nearly a hundred years unhappy Poland was a prey to anarchy, Mongol incursions, Lithuanian idolaters, and even to the attacks of the Teutonic Knights. The accession of Casimir III. put an end to anarchy. This king caused his authority to be acknowledged by all the Poles, and his frontiers to be respected by neighboring princes. Although he lost Silesia, he gained Red Russia, or Galicia ; but not by conquests, nor by his private conduct, did Casimir merit the surname of Great, but by the wisdom of his administration, the tranquillity of his reign, and the written code which he has left, entitled the “Universal Statute.” According to these laws, the nobles alone shared with the king political power, but the peasants enjoyed civil liberty. Hence the nobles called Casimir King of the Peasants. His heir was his nephew, Louis the Great of Hungary, whose daughter Hedwig, crowned *king* of Poland (1384), secured her own happiness, her throne, and her glory by wedding Jagellon, Grand Duke of Lithuania (1386).

Lithuania had remained pagan ; the idol of Perun was still adored in Europe at the end of the fourteenth century. The Teutonic Knights, who had completed the conversion of the Prussians, strenuously warred to reduce the Lithuanians likewise ; but the latter clung to their errors, and by fighting

for them had rooted their independence the more deeply. Gedimin and Olgierd, both intrepid warriors, had succeeded to the grand-ducal throne and had conquered a vast tract. Jagellon, their son and grandson, was not inferior in bravery. He had just succeeded his father when he solicited the hand of Hedwig, promising to become a Christian. He was ugly, ill-shapen, and said to be cruel. Smothering her repugnance, Hedwig consented to the union. Then Poland, increased by all Lithuania, became not only one of the first powers in Europe, but in Jagellon, who took the baptismal name of Ladislaus V., she gained a great king and a fervent Christian. The Lithuanian lords flocked to their prince to be instructed and to receive from his hand a beautiful white robe on the day of their baptism. They were the last Europeans converted. Hedwig of Anjou, sprung from the royal race of France, effected this brilliant triumph for Christianity.

Jagellon, having become Christian, refused to assist the revolt of the Hussites, although they offered him the kingdom of Bohemia. Still he could not allow the Teutonic Knights to encroach on the rights of his crown. He vigorously attacked them at Tannenberg, slew the grand master, six hundred knights, and forty thousand soldiers (1410). This bloody defeat humbled the order, which had greatly degenerated, and guaranteed uncontested ascendancy to Poland. True, Hedwig's father, on succeeding Casimir, had begun the system of the *Pacta Conventa*, which, by favoring the nobility at the expense of the peasants and the king, was one day to bring ruin on Poland; but the danger was averted during the two centuries that the Jagellons reigned (1386-1573).

HUNGARY ; LOUIS THE GREAT (1342–1382) ; SIGISMUND (1387–1437).—With the thirteenth century the Arpad line became extinct amidst disturbances which lasted till the crowning of Charobert (1310). This prince, the great-grandson of Charles of Anjou, brother of St. Louis, was descended from a Hungarian princess. His reign was confined to the strengthening of a dynasty that gave Hungary but one king after himself, Louis. Louis also inherited Poland. Wars to render the Transylvanian Saxons tributary, to extort homage from the Wallachian and Moldavian princes ; struggles with the Venetians to retake Dalmatia ; an expedition to Naples to avenge a slaughtered brother ; a coalition of the Danubian races against invading Turks—such were the leading events of the forty years' reign of Louis of Anjou, King of Hungary. Still, his surname of Great was deserved more because he encouraged agriculture, planted the vineyards of Tokay, favored commerce, protected the peasantry against the magnates, and restored the royal power. He was beloved by the Hungarians, but did not render equal services to Poland during his twelve years' reign there (1370–1382).

After his death, while his youngest daughter, Hedwig, was called to succeed him in the latter country, his eldest daughter, Mary, inherited Hungary, of which she was crowned as *king*. Dissensions at once broke out. Sigismund of Luxembourg espoused the princess. A son of the Emperor Charles IV., a brother of the Emperor Wenceslaus, and himself destined to the empire, Sigismund, already in enjoyment of a rich electorate, was not as welcome to Hungary as his brother-in-law, Jagellon, was to Poland.

Opposed at first by the Hungarian magnates and by unprincipled rivals, he was afterwards harassed by the Ottomans. After the disaster of Nicopolis (1396) he did not appear for six months in Hungary. Thanks to his moderation, he succeeded in regaining his power there, which enabled him to labor for the restoration of order in Bohemia, disturbed by the Hussites, in the Germanic empire, disgraced by his brother Wenceslaus, and in the Holy Church, rent by the great schism.

By giving his daughter Elizabeth in marriage to Albert of Austria, Sigismund indicated the family which was soon to govern the Hungarians without interruption. Albert died the second year of his reign (1439). Ladislaus, King of Poland, was a son of Jagellon, and in him Elizabeth sought a defender for her infant son and for Hungary, which was then at bay; but he, with his army and allies, was exterminated on the day of Varna (1444). Hungary was saved only by Scanderbeg's diversions, the exploits of John Hunyades, and the Crusaders whom St. John Capistran led to the walls of Belgrade. It was to have another great king in Matthias Corvinus, the son of Hunyades (1458-1490).

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE GREEK EMPIRE AND THE OTTOMAN TURKS.

The Greek Empire, successively governed by seven princes of the family of Palaeologus, at first loses nearly all its possessions, then is apparently delivered by Tamerlane's victory over the Ottoman Turks, and finally loses its doubtful existence by the fall of Constantinople.

**Sec. 1. Conquests of the Ottoman Turks till the Battle of Angora (1299–1402).**

WEAKNESS OF THE SECOND GREEK EMPIRE.— Constantinople, taken by surprise from Baldwin II., the last Latin emperor, had opened its gates in triumph to Michael Palaeologus, Emperor of Nicæa (1261). This prince, crowned anew in the Church of St. Sophia, revived the Eastern empire. His possessions, reduced to the provinces surrounding Constantinople, were threatened by the Ottoman Turks in Asia Minor and by the Latins in Europe. These two enemies had an equal dislike for the Greeks : the one, because they were schismatics ; the other, because they were Christians. And they were equally to be feared by the Greeks. Alarmed by the danger, Michael Palaeologus undertook to reconcile the Greek and Latin churches, for the purpose of securing the aid of the Western princes. The union of the two churches was solemnly proclaimed by the Ecumenical Council of Lyons (1274) ; but the emperor was foiled in his efforts to make his subjects accept it, who were as obstinate in schism as they were insensible to their country's peril. Andronicus the Elder, son and successor of Michael, began his

reign (1283) by an open rupture with the Latin Church. This weak-minded monarch, by a just chastisement of Heaven, fell under the dislike and contempt of his subjects, whom he burdened with taxes in order to buy off his enemies or to fight them with mercenaries, who thought less of defending the empire than of conquering it. The Catalans and other auxiliaries from the West even blockaded Constantinople, and took the pompous title of the “Army of the Franks ruling in Thrace and Macedonia.”

Civil war filled the measure of woes. Andronicus the Elder, who had implored the support of the Turks, was nevertheless dethroned by his grandson, Andronicus the Younger (1328). The new emperor, despite his valor, was unable to retain his provinces of Asia Minor, and left the crown to John Palæologus I., then but nine years old. This disastrous reign of half a century opened in anarchy (1341–1391). John Cantacuzenus, guardian of the young monarch, assumed the imperial dignity, and even invested his own son with it; so that there were three emperors at once, who called on the neighboring nations for aid against each other. So many calamities had resulted that Cantacuzenus made a voluntary abdication in the hope of bettering the condition of affairs; but his alliance with the Ottoman Turks had emboldened the future conquerors of Constantinople, and the marriage of his daughter with John Palæologus had only contributed to reveal the extreme misery of the Eastern empire. Amidst the entertainments in the imperial palace costly gems no longer sparkled, and the ancient jewels of the crown were no longer there; the two spouses

were obliged to replace their splendor by the false glitter of colored glass, and, as they no longer had gold and silver vessels, the guests were served in copper cups and pewter plates.

FOUNDATION OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE (1299); TAKING OF GALLIPOLI (1356) AND ADRIANOPOLE (1361).—A few hundred Turks, driven from the borders of the Caspian Sea by the Mongol invasion, had emigrated to Asia Minor. Their warlike character soon rendered them formidable, while the dismemberment of the sultanate of Iconium (Konieh) furnished their chief, Osman, or Ottoman, an opportunity of founding an independent state, which he formed out of territory belonging to the Greeks (1299). The new empire took the name of its founder, and the Turks were thenceforth called Ottomans, or Osmanlis. Orkhan (1326–1360), the son and successor of Osman, having taken Brusa, in Bithynia, after a ten years' blockade, made it his capital. Four years later Nicæa opened its gates to him (1330), and the Greeks speedily lost all their possessions in Asia Minor. Their intestine dissensions permitted the sultan to become in turn their enemy or their ally, as best suited his interests. One of his sons, sent to help John Cantacuzenus, had rendered the Ottoman name so terrible that an unexpected attack gained him an important conquest. Accompanied by only thirty-nine men, he crossed the Hellespont on a raft, and, in disgraceful violation of the treaty with the Greeks, drove them from the stronghold of Gallipoli. By this lawless act the Ottoman Turks gained a footing in Europe (1356). Orkhan had already given them a military organization calculated to secure the success of their invasion.

To the irregular troops the sultan had added a corps of infantry, called from the beginning Yeni Cheri, or New Troop; hence the word janizaries. This valiant militia was recruited from robust Christian children, taken captive or kidnapped from their parents. They were first inspired with frenzied fanaticism, and then were taught the blindest obedience, either by the severity of discipline or by the bait of sensual pleasures. At that time there was no other regular standing army in Europe. Hence the struggle between the janizaries and Christian soldiers was long unequal, particularly as the latter felt that their implacable enemies would have remained their brethren had not Mussulman ferocity snatched them away in childhood from all that is dearest in the world, their family, country, and religion.\*

Amurat (or Murad) I. (1360–1389), a son of Orkhan, on his accession took Adrianople, which became his capital. The Emperor John Palæologus retained nothing beyond the suburbs of Constantinople. Seeing himself threatened by land and sea, he betook himself to Italy to reconcile the Greeks with the Latin Church; but the hapless successor of Constantine the Great was arrested for debt at Venice, and would have died there insolvent had it not been for

\* It is estimated that more than five hundred thousand Christian children were enrolled by the sultans in the militia of the janizaries. To make sure of their fidelity they received higher wages and more abundant food than other troops. The most sacred object in each regiment was the *saucepans*, around which all gathered not only to eat but to hold council. The sultan was called the foster-father, and the colonel chief soup-maker; after the colonel came the chief cook, chief water-carrier, etc. To upset or break the saucépan was the first signal of revolt among the janizaries. This barbarous militia was maintained till the reign of Mahmoud II., who rid himself of them by wholesale massacre (1826).

the filial piety of his son, who rescued him from the hands of his creditors. This humiliation was followed by another less pardonable, as being voluntary and degrading. He had the cowardice to pay tribute to the sultan and to accompany him with troops in all his expeditions (1370). In default of the Greeks the cause of Christianity had found defenders among the races who dwelt along the banks of the Danube. The princes of Servia, Bosnia, and Bulgaria, ever vanquished but never disheartened, made a final effort on the plain of Kossovo, where they engaged in battle (1389) with the sultan. Amurat was again victorious, but as he was crossing the plain, covered with the dead and dying, a Servian, summoning his remaining strength, sprang up and plunged his dagger into the sultan's breast. Thus perished the fierce conqueror whom the Turks surnamed the Workman of God, notwithstanding his barbarity in putting out the eyes of one of his sons and of forcing on several innocent fathers the alternative of cutting their children's throats or having their own cut with them.

**BAYAZID OR BAJAZET I. (1389–1402); BATTLE OF NICOPOLIS (1396).**—Bayazid was scarcely proclaimed sultan than, without even waiting till his father's obsequies were over, he killed his only brother, whose ambition caused him uneasiness. This fratricide, committed with equal despatch and cruelty, gave him the surname of Ilderim (lightning). He deserved it still more by the rapidity of his conquests, as well on the Danube as in Asia Minor, where he reduced the Seljukian emirs, who had hitherto remained independent. Meanwhile, John Palæologus dying, Manuel Palæologus, his son and successor

(1391–1425), escaped from the Turkish camp, where he was retained as a hostage. Bayazid, in revenge, blockaded Constantinople, and boasted that his steed would soon eat oats off the high altar of St. Peter's at Rome. The insolent threat roused Christian Europe. More than one hundred thousand Crusaders advanced along the valley of the Danube under Sigismund, King of Hungary, and John, afterwards surnamed the Fearless, Count of Nevers, and son of the duke of Burgundy. The Christian knights, glorying in their numbers and valor, boasted that if heaven should fall they could uphold it on the points of their spears. This foolish presumption was to cost them dear. The French, who marched in the van without order or discipline, were deaf to the wise counsels of Sigismund. Having fallen with fiery rashness on the first infidel troops they met, they slaughtered many and pursued others to an eminence near Nicopolis. There, instead of completing their victory as they had expected, they encountered the light cavalry of the spahis and the formidable janizaries, the flower of the Ottoman army, which Bayazid prudently held in reserve. The unexpected sight, together with the fatigue and disorder of pursuit, turned their confidence into despair. All of the panic-stricken army who were not killed, wounded, or taken prisoners fled, and King Sigismund had barely time to throw himself into a boat and drop down the Danube to the Black Sea.

The battle-field was strewn with more than fifty thousand infidel corpses. Bayazid, who had been wounded, swore signal vengeance. By his order and under his eyes ten thousand Christian pri-

soners were beheaded, or were beaten to death with clubs. They were heard mutually exhorting one another to martyrdom in view of the reward to follow. The heartless sultan spared none but the count of Nevers, the brave Marshal de Boucicaut, and twenty-three of the most illustrious knights, for whom he expected a high ransom. Skilful in profiting by his victory, he extended his conquests along the Danube, and was at last preparing to take Constantinople when he was deterred by the approach of a more dangerous foe.

**Sec. 2. The Mongol Empire under Timur; the Ottoman Turks to the Taking of Constantinople (1402-1453).**

**TIMUR (1370-1405); HIS EXPEDITIONS AND CONQUESTS.**—In the village of Kesh, near Samarcand, in Independent Tartary, was born, in 1336, the famous conqueror Timur-lenk (the iron), or Tamerlane, called also the Lame, in consequence of a wound he had received in fighting. His ambition early inspired him with the desire of reviving for himself the Mongol empire of Jenghis Khan, from whom he was descended by his mother's side. Sagacious, daring, and cunning, he began by conquering the vast tracts known as Jagatai. Samarcand became his capital. Having summoned a great meeting of Mongol chiefs, he mounted the throne of Jenghis Khan, put a gold crown upon his head, and proclaimed himself lord of the east and the west, swearing to the emirs kneeling at his feet to bring the rulers of the whole world to his sway (1370).

In his first campaign Timur took the opulent city

of Herat by assault, and despoiled it of its riches for the benefit of Samarcand. Terror spread throughout the surrounding countries; all who resisted were either massacred or buried alive. This was only the beginning of the atrocities committed in Persia. The ferocious conqueror struck off seventy thousand heads in the city of Ispahan, and piled them up in the form of towers in the public places. These ghastly trophies everywhere marked Timur's passage. Crossing the Caucasus range, he beat the khan of the Golden Horde, destroyed Azof, menaced Moscow with a like fate, and sent one of his lieutenants to devastate Poland. But God kept this cruel scourge of men from devastating Europe. It was soon learned that he had turned back and crossed Central Asia on his way to India. His arrival at Delhi cost the lives of one hundred thousand Hindoos, who were butchered in cold blood. Both banks of the Ganges were covered with ruins and changed into deserts (1399). The Mongol emperor, proud of having penetrated farther than Alexander the Great or Jenghis Khan, his two heroes, returned in triumph to Samarcand. His insatiable craving for bloodshed left him no rest. Under pretext of avenging the outrage offered to his ambassadors, he directed his march against Syria, twice beat the sultan of the Mamelukes, and reduced Damascus to ashes (1401). Bagdad suffered the same fate. Every Mongol soldier was required to bring at least one head or forfeit his own, and thus one hundred and twenty towers of human heads were raised on the ruins of the immense city.

So many conquests and massacres had inspired the conqueror of Nicopolis with less terror than jealousy.

The proud Bayazid ill-treated the Mongol ambassadors and goaded the fury of their master by an insulting letter. "Know," replied Timur, "that I hold the fate of the world in my hands, and that fortune is my inseparable attendant. Who art thou thus to brave me? Pitiful Turkoman pismire! dost thou dare attack the elephant?" The conqueror appointed the plains of Asia Minor for the encounter. His design was to annex that region to his vast empire, which already stretched from the Mediterranean to the frontiers of China and from the banks of the Ganges to those of the Dnieper.

BATTLE OF ANGORA (1402).—Timur and Bayazid met near Angora, or Ancyra, the former at the head of eight hundred thousand Tartars, the latter with but two hundred thousand Ottoman Turks. Notwithstanding the inferiority of his forces, the sultan had such contempt for his enemy that just before engaging battle he ostentatiously exposed his army to the burning rays of the sun and the fatigues of a great hunt. This imprudence cost him six thousand men and added to the discontent caused by his avarice and debauchery, which scandalized even Mussulmans. Timur, on the contrary, warily added the advantage of position to that of numbers, and carried on secret intrigues in the Ottoman army, while his own soldiers were in repose. His skilfulness and the fanatical devotion of the Mongols assured him the victory. He so acted, however, as if he expected it from heaven alone; for he was a rigid observer of the Koran, which he continually quoted to justify his bloodiest deeds. He alighted from his charger in view of the troops, and made his prayer before giving the signal of battle. Success at first seemed

doubtful. The Christian auxiliaries who formed Bayazid's left repulsed the dense masses of Tartars ; but they beat a retreat on seeing the treachery of the right wing, which entirely passed over to the enemy's ranks. The sultan, surrounded by his janizaries, held out till evening ; but at last, having only a feeble escort remaining, he sought safety in flight, although suffering from fatigue and palsy. He was arrested by Mongol horsemen, who led him, bound, to Timur's tent. The latter, ordering his hands to be untied, gazed fixedly on his captive and began to smile. "Timur," said Bayazid, "deride not my misfortune." Timur, resuming his gravity, replied : "God forbid that I should deride thy misfortune ; but while gazing upon thee I thought how little account God makes of this world's empires, since he bestows them on a paralytic like thee and a cripple like me."

All Asia Minor submitted to the conqueror, and the emperor of Constantinople consented to pay him tribute. Bayazid, though treated with due regard, soon gave way to the shame of his captivity. Timur, on his return from Samarcand, made immense preparations for war on China, which, after the example of Jenghis Khan, he was desirous of conquering. But he died at the outset of his expedition, leaving among his subjects the reputation of a ruler unequalled in arms and in government, of an enlightened patron of science and letters, and so generous and sincere that he preferred a disagreeable truth to a flattering lie. Let his real or supposed qualities be what they may, Timur treated the vanquished with unexampled barbarity, and he is justly considered the most atrocious of conquerors. Frenzied by Moslem fanaticism, he left only bloodshed and ruins in

his track, caring for naught but to glut his ambition and increase his dominion. His empire did not survive him, but one of his great-grandsons founded the empire of the Great Mogul in India, which has been superseded in our own century by British rule.

**AMURAT II. (1421–1451), JOHN HUNYADES, AND SCANDERBEG.**—The captivity of Bayazid, followed by a long civil war among his five sons, seemed to forebode the immediate ruin of the Ottoman empire. Manuel Palæologus, instead of taking advantage of it to extend his dominions, sought to secure the alliance of Mohammed I., who triumphed over his brothers and left the throne to his son, Amurat II. The new sultan, to revenge himself on Manuel, who set up a rival against him, laid siege to Constantinople (1422). The courage of the besieged and the revolt of his brother compelled Amurat to withdraw; but the success of his arms in Asia Minor and Greece confirmed his purpose of one day taking the capital of the Eastern empire. John Palæologus II., the son and successor of Manuel, at first saw but one means of averting the danger; that was to pay tribute to the sultan (1424). But experience taught him that this was only clearing the way for his enemy to Constantinople. Hence he resolved to get help from the West, and was solemnly reconciled with the Latin Church in the Council of Florence (1439). It was no longer degenerate Greeks, but Christians fired with the warm faith of the Crusades, who grappled with the Ottoman Turks. The latter could judge of the difference by their reverses. Worsted in several engagements on the Danube, they fled before the soldiers of a hero whom they called in their terror the Devil, and who had

received from the Christians the surname of the White Knight of Wallachia. His real name was John Hunyades, *waywode*, or prince, of Transylvania. This valiant champion of the cross, once master of the Danube, pursued the infidels along the right bank of the river, cut them to pieces, and rapidly marched upon Adrianople (1443).

The sultan, in turn, trembled for his capital. What added to his alarm was the unexpected defection of one of his lieutenants, whom he had reared at court and loaded with favors. George Castriota, a son of the Christian prince of Albania, was torn in childhood from his family and his religion, and had earned from the Turks, by his extraordinary courage, the cognomen of Scanderbeg, or Prince Alexander. Still he could not forget that he had been born a Christian, and that Amurat had deprived him of his patrimony. Resolving to have no enemies but those of his religion and country, he profited by the rout of the infidels to arrest the secretary of Amurat, and, cimeter in hand, to extort an order in the sultan's name, conferring on him the government of Croya, the capital of Albania. Followed by a handful of brave fellows, Scanderbeg entered Croya, occupied the whole country, and opened a desperate struggle with the Ottoman Turks. His successes, along with those of Hunyades, induced Amurat to sue for peace. The Crusaders committed one error in granting it, and another in violating it in the hope of crushing the infidels. But the sultan, at the head of a numerous army, marched against them, displaying the violated treaty on a pike as a witness of their perjury. The engagement took place in the plains of Varna (1444). At the very outset Hun-

yades broke the left wing of the enemy and drove it pellmell before him. Inspired by the sight, Ladislaus, King of Poland and Hungary, allowing himself to be led by his rash ardor, dashed into the midst of the infidels ; he was overpowered by numbers, and his death was followed by the rout of his troops. The barbarous sultan, cutting off the young monarch's head, sent it to Asia as the most glorious trophy of his victory.

John Hunyades, named regent of Hungary, burned to retaliate. Without awaiting his ally, Scanderbeg, he gave battle at Kossovo, in the Field of Blackbirds ; he there slew or disabled forty thousand infidels, but still could not wrest victory from them (1448). His defeat was a grievous blow to John Palæologus, who survived it but a few days. The valiant Scanderbeg, emboldened rather than intimidated by the peril, was still able to humble the sultan's pride. Twice did Amurat advance to the walls of Croya, and twice was he forced to retire ; dying of rage and vexation, he ordered his son Mohammed to turn all his forces against the capital of the East.

CONSTANTINE XII. (1448-1453) AND MOHAMMED II. (1451-1481) ; TAKING OF CONSTANTINOPLE (1453).—Constantine XII., like his brother John Palæologus, was obliged to pay tribute to the Turks. In return, under a solemn oath, Mohammed II. had guaranteed him the peaceful possession of his empire. But the ferocious sultan, who had begun his reign by fratricide, had no more regard for treaties than for ties of flesh and blood. His long-premeditated projects of conquest haunted his very slumbers. To ensure success he had an immense fortress constructed on the European shore of the Bosphorus. Being

thus master of the straits, he then laid violent hands on the Greeks of the neighborhood, and answered their complaints by a declaration of war. At the head of two hundred and fifty thousand men, supported by a fleet of four hundred sail, he laid siege to Constantinople by land and sea (April 6, 1453).

The city contained scarcely ten thousand soldiers, twenty-five hundred of whom were Italians from Genoa and Venice, the only ones who had rallied at the sovereign pontiff's summons. Three hundred thousand Turks sat down before Constantinople. But nothing could dispel the prejudices of the Greek schismatics ; not even the sight of impending danger, nor the example and entreaties of the emperor, who had embraced the Catholic faith. “ Away with them ! We want no Latin allies ! Away with the worship of the Azymites !” they cried. The presence of Cardinal Isidore, the legate of the Holy See, was more displeasing to them than the prospect of infidel rule, and Notaras, the high admiral of the empire, was heard to say with the malcontents that he would “ rather have the turban of Mohammed than the pope’s tiara in Constantinople.” But the most terrible of chastisements was reserved for these blind fanatics, though it was delayed by the heroic faith and courage of Constantine. Daily he was seen at the head of his men, repelling assaults, while at night he directed the workmen who were repairing the breaches made in the walls by the terrible artillery of the enemy.\*

\* Mohammed II. had a great number of cannon which propelled balls of one hundred and fifty to three hundred pounds. He had constructed one that was so enormous as to hurl balls of twelve hundred pounds, and it required fifty yoke of oxen and more than seven hundred men to transport and work it. The superiority of the Ottoman over the Greek artillery greatly contributed to the taking of Constantinople.

The Italians fought like lions. The struggle continued without rest, and, carried on by both sides with equal fury, had been protracted for several weeks without any decided advantage, when an extraordinary manœuvre brought it to a close.

A massive chain stretched across the outer end of the port shut out the Ottoman fleet. Mohammed hit upon the plan of entering it by a long detour. During the night he transported eighty ships overland by sliding them along on greased planks, and launched them in the very centre of the port, back of the suburb of Galata. The besieged were equally dismayed and astounded to find themselves in danger from the quarter where they felt most secure. They made many efforts to extricate their own vessels and burn those of the Mussulmans, but in vain. The last hour had come. Constantine prepared for it by an action worthy of a Christian emperor. After hearing Mass and receiving Communion in the basilica of St. Sophia, he offered up his life to God in expiation of his own sins and his people's; then he exhorted the warriors to perish gloriously fighting rather than to yield to the infidels, and he ordered the non-combatant multitude to pray for their countrymen in the battle. This stirring scene ended with tears and embraces. The emperor, mounting his horse, hastened to the ramparts (May 29, 1453). The whole Ottoman army, uttering furious yells, began the attack at dawn. The sultan, to spur on his soldiers, spared neither threats nor promises: death to cowards, three days' pillage for those who entered the city. The fury of the assailants was long powerless against defenders resolved to die for their faith and their coun-

try; but numbers at last prevailed. Constantinople, falling for the first time into the hands of barbarians, underwent all the indescribable horrors of a city given up to sack. Its inhabitants, to the number of upwards of 100,000, were reduced to slavery, massacred, or, as happened to the high admiral of the empire, were reserved for the most exquisite tortures devised by Moslem fanaticism. Some distinguished Greeks found shelter in the Venetian galleys, and thus escaped to Italy, where they were welcomed by the pope and others of the Italians. Their arrival in Italy gave a new impulse to letters and learning.

Constantine had disappeared in the breach in the height of the mêlée. His corpse was recognized by his purple buskins; his head was cut off and taken to Mohammed. The sultan sent this bloody witness of his triumph amongst all his people in Asia, and he turned the magnificent basilica of St. Sophia into a mosque. Thus fell the Eastern empire eleven hundred and twenty-three years after the foundation of Constantinople, and nine hundred and seventy-seven years after the fall of the Western empire. The history of the Middle Ages ends with this dire catastrophe, which follows close upon the great schism, and coincides with the conclusion of the Hundred Years' War.

# REVIEW QUESTIONS.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

Why is the period treated in this history called the Middle Ages? What distinguishes them as a period? What was the extent of the Roman Empire at the end of the fourth century? How was it governed? What is said of the decay of patriotism? How did the Romans divide the barbarian territory? Mention the principal tribes and nations of the Germans. What were the characteristics of the Germans? What was their government? their religion? Name the principal Slavic tribes. What is said of the Scythian race? What of the invasion of the Huns? How did Valens deal with the Visigoths? What do you remark of the Church at this time? State the Epochs of the Middle Ages.

## FIRST EPOCH.

### CHAPTER I.

*Section 1.*—How did Theodosius divide the empire? What is said of Stilicho and his rival? Describe Alaric's exploits before Constantinople; in Greece. Narrate his first invasion of Italy. What is said of the last gladiatorial combat at Rome? What is said of Radagaisus? What of the barbarians in Gaul? Relate Alaric's second invasion of Italy, and his death. Who was Ataulf? Wallia?

*Section 2.*—What followed the contentions of Aëtius and Count Boniface? Describe Genseric's career in Africa; in the Mediterranean. What is said of Attila personally? of his invasion of Gaul? of Italy? of his death?

*Section 3.*—Describe Genseric's taking of Rome. How did the barbarian "confederates" dispose of the imperial purple? What is said of Odoacer?

### CHAPTER II.

*Section 1.*—What was the origin of the Franks? What tribes held Gaul at the appearance of Clovis? What is said of Clovis before his conversion? Describe his conversion; his subsequent career.

*Section 2.*—How was the Frankish kingdom divided at the death of Clovis? What is said of Theodebert and the Emperor Justinian? Relate the rivalry between Bruncnaut and Fredegunda. What is said of Dagobert I.?

### CHAPTER III.

What was the condition of Britain before the Saxon invasion? Describe the first appearance in Britain of the Saxons; of the Angles. What was the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy? What became of the Britons? What part had St. Gregory the Great in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons? Describe St. Austin's labors.

### CHAPTER IV.

What is said of the kingdom of the Visigoths in the fifth century? What was the religion of the Visigoths? How were they led to the true faith?

### CHAPTER V.

*Section 1.*—How did Odoacer rule Italy from his capital of Ravenna?

*Section 2.*—Who was Theodoric? What is said of the Ostrogoth invasion

of Italy, and of the death of Odoacer ? What was the extent of Theodoric's dominion ? What was his conduct towards the Church ?

*Section 3.*—What were the characteristics of the Lower Empire ? Who was the founder of the Thracian dynasty ? What is said of Justin I. ? What constituted the glory of Justinian's reign ? Describe Belisarius's campaign against the Vandals. What is said of Vitiges ? What of Totila ? Name and describe Justinian's contributions to Roman law. How did Phocas become emperor ?

*Section 4.*—What is said of the manners and of the appearance of the Lombards ? Describe their invasion of Italy ; their settlement there.

### CHAPTER VI.

*Section 1.*—What dogma was attacked by the Arian and Macedonian heresies ? What was the Pelagian heresy ? the Nestorian ? the Eutychian ? What was one of the unfortunate results that followed Oriental schisms ? What was the origin of the monastic life ? What is said of St. Benedict and his order ? What of literature and the arts at this period in the East ? and in the West ?

*Section 2.*—What do you remark in connection with the Arianism of the barbarians ? Why may the Franks be called the "eldest sons of the Church" ? What was the condition of the Church under Pope St. Gregory I. ? Mention Pope Gregory's principal achievements.

### SECOND EPOCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

*Section 1.*—Who were the "Sluggard" kings ? What is said of the mayors of the palace ? What of Pepin of Landen ? Of Pepin of Heristal ? Who was Charles Martel ? Describe the battle of Tours.

*Section 2.*—How was the temporal sovereignty of the popes founded ? What was Charlemagne's first exploit ? What is said of his struggle with the Saxons ? Describe his coronation ; his subsequent military career. What were the capitulars ? What schools did he establish ? What is said of his learning ? and of his patronage of literature ?

#### CHAPTER II.

*Section 1.*—What is said of Mohammed's early life ? What of Islam's first converts ? What is the Hegira ? and its date ? Relate the circumstances of Mohammed's death. What is the Koran ? and how was it composed ? and compiled ? What are the fundamental points of its doctrine ? Mention some of its precepts.

*Section 2.*—How was Mohammed succeeded ? What is said of the invasion of Syria ? of the taking of Jerusalem ? How did the Mussulmans succeed in conquering Egypt ? What is said of the destruction of the Alexandrian library ? What are the two principal sects of Islam ?

*Section 3.*—What is said of the first Ommiade caliph's accession ? What conquests did he make ? What of the final destruction of Carthage ? What led to the Mussulman invasion of Spain ? Describe the Mussulman's landing ; the battle of Xeres. What is said of the hero of the Asturias ? What of Abd-er-Rahman's invasion of Gaul ? Describe Caliph Soliman's attack on Constantinople. Who were the Abbasides ?

*Section 4.*—What is said of Harun-al-Rashid ? What of the Moslems at Cordova ?

*Section 5.*—How did the Arabs get credit for the inventions of others ? What is said of their lack of originality in literature ? What of the specialties of Arabic learning ? of their barbarism ?

#### CHAPTER III.

*Section 1.*—What is said of Heraclius and the Monothelite heresy ? Of Constantine Pogonatus ? Of Justinian Rhinotmetus ?

*Section 2.*—What is said of Leo the Isaurian and the iconoclastic edict ? What of the Empress Irene ?

## CHAPTER IV.

What contributed to establish the temporal independence of the popes? How did Charles Martel bestow ecclesiastical dignities? What is said of St. Columba—Columbanus—Gall—Adalbert—Erhard—Willibord—Boniface? What is said of the monastic life at this epoch? What of literature in the East? In the West? What were the Seven Liberal Arts?

## THIRD EPOCH.

## CHAPTER I.

*Section 1.*—What caused the dismemberment of the Carlovingian empire? How was it first divided? What was the result of the battle of Fontenay? What is said of the Norman siege of Paris? What was the final division of the empire?

*Section 2.*—What was the difference between a freehold and a fief? How were freeholds turned into fiefs? How did Charles the Bald favor the great proprietors? What was homage? fealty? investiture? What rights had the suzerain over the vassal? Name the various grades of the feudal hierarchy. How was feudalism introduced into the Church?

*Section 3.*—Who was Hugh Capet, and how did he come to the throne of France? What was the origin of hereditary succession to the throne? What was the Trace of God?

## CHAPTER II.

*Section 1.*—What were the principal Saracen strongholds in the Mediterranean? What is said of the Saracens in Italy? in France? in the Alps? What of the first appearance of the Magyars in Europe? What is said of the conversion of Vače?

*Section 2.*—Who were the Northmen? Relate the conversion of the Russians. What is said of the Northmen's discoveries? What of Alfred the Great at Egbert's Stone? What is the supposed origin of the jury? What was the Witenagemot? How did Alfred the Great encourage learning? What was the "Day of the great Combat"? Describe Sweyn's landing in England, and his vengeance. Give the anecdote of Canute the Great at the sea-shore. What was the treaty of St. Clair-sur-Epte?

*Section 3.*—What is said of the battle of Canne? What of Leo IX. and the Normans? What instance occurred later of Norman loyalty to the popes? How was the kingdom of the Two Sicilies established? What was William of Normandy's claim to the English crown? Describe the battle of Hastings. What is said of the "Camp of Refuge"? What was the Doomsday Book? the curfew? the "Presentment of Englishry"? Did any good result to England from the Norman conquest?

## CHAPTER III.

*Section 1.*—Who were the last two Carlovingians of Germany? What is said of Henry the Fowler's accession? What of his campaign against the Magyars? What characterized the accession of Otho the Great?

*Section 2.*—Relate the vicissitudes of Berenger's attempts to gain power. Name the independent principalities of Italy at this time.

*Section 3.* What is said of the battle of the Lech? Relate the circumstances of Pope John XII.'s accession; of Otho's coronation as emperor; of Otho's setting up an anti-pope. What is said of the elective quality of German royalty at this time? How did the family of Franconia come to the throne?

*Section 4.*—What is said of Cis-Juran Burgundy? What of Trans-Juran Burgundy?

## CHAPTER IV.

*Section 1.*—What is said of the last two great caliphs of Cordova? What of Al-Mansur? What were the principal achievements of the first king of Castile? What is said of the Cid? What of the Karmatians? the Isma'ilians? the Assassins?

*Section 2.*—What is said of Photius's consecration? of his reproaches

against the Roman Church? What characterized the reigns of Leo the Philosopher and Constantine Porphyrogenitus? What Byzantine emperors won some glory at this period? How did the patriarch Michael Cerularius complete the schism of the Greek Church?

### CHAPTER V.

*Section 1.*—What is said of the reciprocal support of the popes and the emperors at this time? What of the heresy of the Manicheans? What bad effect did feudalism have on the clergy? What is said of the Abbey of Cluny? What of Guido of Arezzo? Of Pope Sylvester II.?

*Section 2.*—Relate the labors of St. Anscarinus. How was Christianity established in Denmark? in Sweden? How did the Norwegians gain their first knowledge of Christianity?

*Section 3.*—What was the nature of Slavic mythology? What is said of Slavic fickleness in religion at this time? Who were the chief apostles of the Slavic nations? What is said of the first translation of the Scriptures into Slavonian? What drew the Bulgarians into schism? What motive induced the Poles to adopt Christianity? What is said of the conversion of the Russians? What resulted from King Stephen's marriage to a German princess? What is said of the Church's conquests from heathenism? How was a large part of Europe changed by these conversions?

### FOURTH EPOCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

*Section 1.*—What sin most afflicted the Church in the eleventh century? What was the chief cause of the disorders in the Church at this time? Relate the events of Hildebrand's monastic life. Describe an Ordeal of Fire at Florence. What was St. Gregory VII.'s first measure of reform? How was it met by Henry IV.? How did the Pope enforce his decree? Describe the meeting at Canossa. How did Henry get himself crowned? Give the circumstances of Gregory's death. What were Pope Urban II.'s principal achievements? How did Henry spend the last years of his life? What compromise did Pope Pascal II. make with Henry V.? What was the terms of the Concordat of Worms?

*Section 2.*—What is said of the growth of independence among the Italian cities? What was the carroccio? What were Arnold of Brescia's teachings? Give an example of heresy appealing to absolute? What was the dispute between Conrad and Henry the Proud? Describe the assault on Winsberg Castle, and its capture. What was Arnold of Brescia's fate? How did Frederick Barbarossa deal with Rome? with Milan? What is said of the Lombard League? Describe the meeting of Pope Alexander III. and Frederick Barbarossa at Venice. What of the government of the Italian republics? their politics? What of the conflict between Pope Innocent III. and Otho IV.? How did Frederick II. display his hypocrisy? What promises made at his coronation did he break? What is said of the Decretals of Raymond of Peñafort? How did Frederick II. employ Saracens in Italy? What took place at the Council of Lyons concerning the emperor? What was the character of Frederick II.? What is said of the Guelphs and Ghibelines in Italy? What was Conradin's fate? What is meant by the Long Interregnum?

#### CHAPTER II.

*Section 1.*—What is said of the veneration for the Holy Land? How did the Mussulmans treat the pilgrims? How did the Seljukians Turks first appear in Asia Minor? What is said of their dominion under Malek-Shah? What is said of the Old Man of the Mountain and his followers? How did Alexis Comnenus display his perfidy? Who was Peter the Hermit, and how did he appeal to Europe? What is said of Pope Urban II. and the Council of Clermont? What was the fortune of Peter the Hermit's army? Describe the composition of the regular army in the first Crusade. How did Alexis deal with the Crusaders? Describe their operations on the march to

Antioch ; at Antioch ; their siege and taking of Jerusalem ; the choice and coronation of the first king of Jerusalem. What was the organization and subsequent career of the Knights Hospitalers ? Of the Templars ?

*Section 2.*—What caused the second Crusade ? What nations took part in this Crusade, and what route did each take ? What is said of Damietta ? Of the battle of Tiberias ? Of Saladin's tithe ? What nations engaged in the third Crusade ? What is said of Frederick Barbarossa in this Crusade ? What of the rivalry between Philip Augustus and Richard Coeur de Lion ? What of Richard at Acre ? Of his exploits in Palestine ? Of his imprisonment and release ? What was the origin, organization, and career of the Teutonic Knights ?

*Section 3.*—How did Dandolo shame the avarice of his fellow-citizens during the fourth Crusade ? How did the Crusaders behave at Constantinople ? How was the Lower Empire parcelled out ? What was the after-history of the Latin empire of Constantinople ? What was the motive of the Children's Crusade ? What was its fate ? Describe John of Brienne's campaigns in Egypt during the fifth Crusade. What were Frederick II.'s exploits in the sixth Crusade ?

*Section 4.*—What was the cause of the seventh Crusade ? Why was it directed against Egypt and not against Jerusalem ? What success had it ? What was the cause of the eighth Crusade ? What its result ? What effect had the Crusades on the commerce, on the manufactures of Europe ? What important political effect had they ? How did they influence the arts ? the sciences ? What were the grades of knighthood, and what the requisite age and occupation of each ? Describe the preparation for receiving knighthood ; the ceremony of knighting ; the ceremony of degrading a knight. What was the effect of chivalry on manners ?

### CHAPTER III.

*Section 1.*—How did the beaten Moors avenge themselves on Alfonso the Brave ? What is said of Affonso I. of Portugal ? What of Urraca of Castile ? Of Alfonso the Battler ? What orders of chivalry arose at this time in Spain ? Describe Mohammed's invasion of Spain ; the battle of Tolosa. What were James the Conqueror's principal achievements ? How did St. Ferdinand extend his dominion ? What was his character ? Where and when was gunpowder first used in Europe ?

*Section 2.*—What was the heresy of the Albigenses ? What powerful noble sustained them ? Who was Simon of Montfort ? Describe Simon's conduct at Muret. What were the terms of the treaty of Meaux ?

*Section 3.*—What was the origin of the Knights of the Sword ? What did the Teutonic Knights accomplish in Prussia ?

### CHAPTER IV.

*Section 1.*—What was the dispute between Philip and William the Conqueror ? What is said of the rise of free cities in Europe ? What of the origin of communes ? What were the privileged cities ? What resulted from the growing importance of cities ? What is said of Philip Augustus and John of England ? What success had St. Louis against the English ? How did he govern France ?

*Section 2.*—What was the condition of affairs in England under William Rufus and his minister ? How did Henry I. win the affection of his Anglo-Saxon subjects ? What was the Battle of the Standard ? What was England's condition under Stephen ? What is said of Henry II.'s pomp at Paris, and of his ambassador there ? What was the dispute over the Constitutions of Clarendon ? What is said of Thomas à Becket's exile ? Of his martyrdom ? What tribes successively settled in Ireland ? What heroes are mentioned before the fifth century ? How were the clans organized and governed ? What was the religion of the ancient Irish ? What is said of the introduction of Christianity ? Of the spread of learning ? Describe the Ostmen's invasion and settlement. How did the battle of Clontarf result ? What was the cause of MacMurroch's flight ? What is said of Strongbow's landing and first attempts at conquest ? What success attended Edward Bruce's attempts ? What was the Statute of Kilkenny ? How did Henry seek to make amends for the murder of St. Thomas à Becket ? How was

Henry treated by his wife and children ? Why was the interdict proclaimed in England ? How was John reconciled with the pope ? What is said of the barons at Runnymede, and of Magna Charta ? What is said of the first open sea engagement between England and France ? What was the Mad Parliament, and why did it assemble ? What was the origin of the House of Commons ? Describe the battle of Evesham.

### CHAPTER V.

*Section 1.*—What was the extent of Scandinavia in the twelfth century ? What were the sagas ? Relate the exploits of Sigurd of Norway. What is said of St. Eric of Sweden ? What of Sweyn and his five sons in Denmark ? How did Waldemar the Great govern the country ? Relate the achievements of Waldemar the Victorious.

*Section 2.*—Mention the Slavic nations and their condition. What was the Golden Bull ? What princes of Poland were distinguished in the eleventh and twelfth centuries ? How did religious schism cut off Russia from Western civilization and support ? What caused great discord in Russia at this time ?

*Section 3.*—Narrate the events of Jenghis Khan's boyhood and early career ; his wars against the Tartar empire ; against the Khorasmians ; against the Russians. How were the Mongolians met in Hungary ? in Poland ? What is said of the destruction of the Assassins ? What is said of the Mongols at Pekin ?

### CHAPTER VI.

*Section 1.*—What great things took place during the "Ages of Faith" ? How were the popes able to secure liberty for the people, peace between nations, and subjection to lawful authority ? What is said of the monastic orders of Cluny ? of the Good Men ? of the Carthusians ? of the Cistercians ? What is said of the Regular Canons ? of the Premonstratensians ? What rules were followed by the several military orders ? What distinguished friars from monks ? What is said of the Dominicans ? of the Franciscans ? of the Carmelites ? of the Augustinians ? What is meant by first, second, and third orders ? What is said of the charitable orders of the Holy Ghost ? of the Trinitarians ? of Mercy ? What of the Servites ? How were the Baltic tribes brought to the faith ? How came Buddhism by ceremonies and observances similar to those of the Church ? Who was Prester John ? What attempts were afterwards made to reach his empire ? Why was the Inquisition established ? Who was responsible for the severe punishment inflicted on heretics ?

*Section 2.*—What gave birth to the science of scholastic theology ? What is said of nominalism and realism ? What of Lanfranc—St. Anselm—Aberlard—the "Master of the Sentences"—St. Bernard—Averroës—Maimonides—Albertus Magnus—the Angelic Doctor—the Seraphic Doctor ? How was the study of civil law revived ? How was the study of canon law encouraged ? What is said of the rise of the universities ? What is said of the two great cycles of romances ? What were the mystery-plays ? How did the Gothic replace the classic styles of architecture ? What is said of the other arts at this time ?

## FIFTH EPOCH.

### CHAPTER I.

*Section 1.*—What led to the bull *Clericis laicos* ? How was it met by Philip the Fair ? Describe the dispute over the papal legate. What was the cause and the substance of the bull *Unam sanctam* ? How did the servility of the French States-General favor schism ? Describe the outrage on the sovereign pontiff at Anagni. What is meant by the Renaissance ? (Note.) How did the papal residence come to be fixed at Avignon ? What was done at the Council of Vienne ? What was probably Philip's motive in demanding the suppression of the Templars ? What is said of the attempted Roman republic ?

*Section 2.*—Relate the circumstances of Urban VI.'s election at Rome. What caused the two "obediences" ? What rules did St. Antoninus lay down for the faithful ? How did the University of Paris attempt to heal the great

schism? What success had the Council of Pisa in the same matter? How did the Council of Constance end the schism? What is said of John Huss? How did the Council of Basle behave? How was the Greek Church reconciled at the Council of Florence?

## CHAPTER II.

*Section 1.*—What was the extent of Philip the Fair's dominions? How did the Welsh contend for their independence? What is the origin of the title of Prince of Wales? Describe the dispute over the crown in Scotland. What is said of Robert Bruce and the battle of Bannockburn? How did the English sovereigns come to call themselves "King of France"? What is said of the battle of Crécy? of Poitiers? What outbreaks took place in France during the captivity of John the Good? What is said of the Constable Du Guesclin?

*Section 2.*—What were Wickliffe's doctrines, and how were they encouraged in England? What is said of the communistic notions of his followers? Describe Wat Tyler's revolt. How did Henry of Lancaster make himself king? What was characteristic of the Stuart dynasty? What perfidy was he guilty of to the Scots? How did Henry V. change his ways on coming to the throne? Describe his military operations in France. How was France governed during Charles VI.'s incapacity? What is said of Joan of Arc? How was the Hundred Years' War between France and England ended? Who was Jack Cade?

## CHAPTER III.

*Section 1.*—How did the family of Hapsburg reach the imperial throne? Relate the vicissitudes of Louis of Bavaria's reign. What was the Golden Bull? What is said of Wenceslaus' reign in Bohemia? Describe the operations of the Taborites.

*Section 2.*—What is said of the Hapsburgs' connection with Switzerland? Describe the battle of Morgarten; Sempach; Næfels.

*Section 3.*—What was the policy of the Guelphs in Italy? Give the circumstances of the Sicilian Vespers. How did Robert of Anjou behave as imperial vicar? What is said of the great Lombard family of Visconti? Name the possessions of Venice and of Genoa in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Describe the siege of Venice. How was Venice governed? What is said of the families of Medici, Gonzaga, Sforza? What was the political condition of Italy in the fifteenth century?

## CHAPTER IV.

What is said of the kingdom of Navarre? What of Portugal under Diniz? What of the career of Alfonso XI. of Castile? What crowned monsters afflicted Spain at this time? How did Pedro the Just avenge the cruel fate of Iñez de Castro? Give a brief account of the career of Ferdinand the Just of Aragon and Castile; of Isabella the Catholic. What is said of Henry of Avisa, Infante of Portugal?

## CHAPTER V.

*Section 1.*—Relate the achievements of the "Semiramis of the North" before the Union of Calmar; during and after that event.

*Section 2.*—Give some instances of Russian servility to barbarian hordes. What two Slavic nations loyally battled for the Church and civilization? How did Casimir the Great rule Poland? Describe the conversion of Lithuania. What success did Sigismund meet as king of Hungary?

## CHAPTER VI.

*Section 1.*—How was the revived Greek Empire harassed about the end of the thirteenth century? What is said of its poverty under Cantacuzenus? What was the origin of the Ottoman Turks? How did they gain a foothold in Europe? Give a description of the origin, organization, and characteristics of the janizaries. Give a summary of the principal events of Bayazid's life.

*Section 2.*—Give a brief account of Timur's career. Of John Hunyades's. Of Scanderbeg's. Describe the siege and taking of Constantinople.

# APPENDIX.

---

## CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE HISTORY OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

### *Fourth Century.*

Final partition of the Roman Empire, 395 ; Alaric in Greece, 396 ; Disgrace of Eutropius, 399 ; Alaric in Italy, 400.

### *Fifth Century.*

Second invasion of Alaric in Italy—Pollentia, 402 ; Invasion of Radagaisius—Florence, 406 ; Great invasion of Gaul, 407 ; Death of Stilicho, 408 ; Siege of Rome by Alaric, 408, 409, 410, and death of Alaric ; Foundation of the kingdom of the Burgundians, 413 ; Vandals, Suevi, and Alans in Spain, Visigoths in Aquitania, 414 ; Wallia, 415, and Theodosic I., 419–451, in Aquitania and in Spain ; Valentinian III., Emperor of the West, 425–455 ; Vandals in Africa, 429–535 ; First invasion of Saxons and Angles in Britain, 449 ; Attila in Gaul—Châlons-sur-Marne, 451 ; Attila before St. Leo, 452 ; Death of Attila, 453 ; of Aëtius, 454 ; of Valentinian III., 455 ; Sack of Rome by Genseric, 455 ; Ricimer and the Patrician Orestes—End of the Western Empire, 476 ; Heresy of Nestorius, 429, and Eutyches, 449, in the East ; Marcian, 450, and Leo I., 457, orthodox emperors ; Zeno, 474, and Anastasius, 491, abettors of heresies ; Mission and labor of St. Patrick in the conversion of Ireland, 432–465 ; Foundation of the Saxon kingdoms of Kent, 455, and Sussex, 491, in Britain ; Establishment of the Franks under Clovis in Gaul, 486 ; Conversion of the Franks, 496 ; Death of Odoacer—Establishment of the Ostrogoths under Theodosic in Italy, 493 ; Caledonia, or Scotland, settled by Scots from Ireland, 498 ; Victory of Clovis over Gundebald, 500.

*Sixth Century.*

Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy completed, 584; conversion begun, 597; Battle of Voglade, 597; Subjection of the Burgundians, 534; Expeditions of the Franks in Thuringia, in Italy and Spain—Subjection of the Suevi, 585; Conversion of the Visigoths, 587; End of the Vandal kingdom, 535; Belisarius in Italy, 536; Narses, 552; End of the kingdom of the Ostrogoths, 553; Foundation of the kingdom of the Lombards—Alboin, 568–573; Justin I., Emperor, 518; Reign of Justinian, 527–565; Roman law—St. Sophia—Justin II., 565; Pope St. Gregory the Great, 590–604.

*Seventh Century.*

Bloody usurpation of Phocas, 602; Accession of Heraclius, 610; Clotaire II. sole king of France, 613; Taking of Jerusalem by Chosroes II., 615; Retaliation of Heraclius, 622–627; Flight or Hegira of Mohammed, 622; Death of Mohammed, 632; The Mohammedans invade Syria, 632, Persia, 633, Egypt, 638, all Northern Africa, 645–700; the Ommiade caliphs, 690–750; Siege of Constantinople, 671–678; Capture and destruction of Carthage, 693; Condemnation of the Monothelites, 690; Battle of Testry, 697; Pepin of Heristal, 687–714.

*Eighth Century.*

Invasion of Spain by Tarik and battle of Xeres, 711; Death of Pepin, 714; Charles Martel, Duke of the Franks, 715; Second siege of Constantinople, 717; The Iconoclasts, 726; Invasions of the Saracens in France—Battle of Poitiers, 732; Deaths of Charles Martel, Leo the Isaurian, and Pope St. Gregory III., 741; Invasion of Ireland by the Danes, or Ostmen, 748; Pepin the Short sole duke, 747, then king of the Franks, 752; The Abbasside caliphs, 750; Caliphate of Cordova, 756; Death of Pepin the Short, 768; Charlemagne sole king of the Franks, 771; End of the Lombard kingdom, 774; Wars against the Saxons, 772–806; Death of Roland, 778; Harun-al-Rashid, 786–809; Condemnation of the Iconoclasts, 787; Irene, Empress of the East, 797; Charlemagne, Emperor of the West, December 25, 800.

*Ninth Century.*

Egbert the Great, King of Wessex, 801, afterwards of the whole Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy, 827 ; First descent of the Normans in France, 808 ; Death of Charlemagne and accession of Louis the Débonnaire, 814 ; Partition of the Frankish states, 817 ; Birth of Charles the Bald, 823 ; Deposition and restoration of Louis, 830 ; His death, 840 ; Battle of Fontanet, 841 ; Treaty and partition of Verdun, 843 ; Ravages of the Normans, 845 ; Intrusion of Photius, 857 ; Fourth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, 869 ; Origin of the Russian monarchy—Rurik, 862 ; Charles the Bald emperor, 875 ; Edict of Kiersy and death of the emperor, 877 ; New ravages of the Normans on the Seine, 886 ; Deposition of Charles the Fat and final partition of the Frankish empire, 888 ; Death of Eudes, King of France, 898, Arnulf, King of Germany and Emperor, 899, and Alfred the Great, King of England, 900.

*Tenth Century.*

Rollo, chief of the Normans, 901 ; Foundation of Normandy, extinction of the Carlovingians in Germany, and abdication of Alfonso the Great, King of Asturias, 911 ; Foundation of Cluny, 910 ; Beginning of the Fatimites, 908 ; Sack of Mecca by the Karmatians, 929 ; The Fatimites at Cairo, 969 ; The Gaznevides, 961–1104 ; Abd-er-Rahman III. at Cordova, 911–961 ; Accession of Otho the Great to the Germanic throne, 936 ; Otho, King of Italy, 951, Emperor of the West, 962 ; Basil II., Emperor of the East, 963–1025 ; St. Vladimir, 980 ; Hugh Capet, 987 ; Pope Sylvester II., 999–1003 ; Conversion of the Hungarians, 1000.

*Eleventh Century.*

Death of the Emperor Otho III., 1002 ; Defeat of the Danes at Clontarf, in Ireland, by Brian Boru, 1014 ; Canute the Great, King of Denmark and England, 1014 ; Death of St. Henry, Emperor, 1024 ; Sancho the Great, King of all Christian Spain, 1028 ; Truce of God, 1032 ; Death of Rudolph III., last king of Burgundy, 1033 ; Death of the Emperor Conrad II., 1039 ; St. Leo IX., Pope, 1049 ; Accession of the Emperor Henry IV., 1056 ; St. Gregory

VII., Pope, 1073 ; Interview at Canossa, 1077 ; Tancred's sons in Italy, 1040 ; William the Conqueror in England, 1066 ; Origin of the Seljukian Turks, 1037 ; Alexis Comnenus, 1081 ; Council of Clermont and first Crusade, 1095 ; Taking of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, 1099 ; Death of Godfrey of Bouillon, 1100 ; Order of Hospitalers, 1100.

*Twelfth Century.*

Order of Templars, 1118 ; Concordat of Worms and end of the investitures, 1122 ; Death of the Emperor Henry V., 1125 ; Schism of Anacletus, 1130 ; Roger, King of Sicily, 1137 ; Affonso Henriquez, king of Portugal, 1139 ; Guelphs and Ghibelines in Germany—Accession of the Hohenstaufens, 1137 ; Foundation of the sect of Almohades, 1140 ; Second Crusade, 1147 ; Death of St. Bernard, 1153 ; Frederick Barbarossa, Emperor, 1152, and Alexander III., Pope, 1159 ; The Lombard league, 1169 ; Peace of Constance, 1183 ; Waldemar the Great, King of Denmark, 1157 ; The Plantagenets in England, 1153 ; Martyrdom of St. Thomas à Becket, 1170 ; Invasion of Ireland by Anglo-Normans under Henry II., 1171 ; Taking of Jerusalem by Saladin, 1187 ; Third Crusade, 1189 ; Foundation of the Teutonic Order, 1190 ; Pontificate of Innocent III., 1198–1216.

*Thirteenth Century.*

Fourth Crusade, 1201 ; Latin Empire of Constantinople, 1204 ; Crusade against the Albigenses, 1208 ; Battle of Muret, 1213 ; Mendicant orders, 1216 ; Battle of Las-Navas-de Tolosa, 1212 ; Battle of Bouvines, 1214 ; Magna Charta in England, 1215 ; Ravages of Jenghis Khan in Khorasmia, 1217 ; Fifth Crusade, 1218 ; Frederick II. crowned emperor, 1220 ; Death of Philip Augustus, 1223, Louis VIII., 1226, and accession of St. Louis ; Death of Jenghis Khan, 1227 ; Frederick II. excommunicated at the first Council of Lyons, 1245 ; The Long Interregnum, 1250–1273 ; Mongols in Hungary, 1241 ; Seventh Crusade, 1248 ; Eighth Crusade, 1270, and death of St. Louis ; Election of Rudolph of Hapsburg, 1273 ; The Sicilian Vespers, 1282 ; Boniface VIII., Pope, 1294 ; Universal jubilee, 1300.

*Fourteenth Century.*

Disputes of Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII., 1301 ; Election of Clement V., 1305 ; Trial of the Templars, 1309 ; English routed at Bannockburn, 1314 ; John XXII., Pope, at Avignon, 1316 ; Death of Othman, 1326 ; Louis of Bavaria at Rome—Philip of Valois, King of France, 1328 ; Beginning of the Hundred Years' War, 1337 ; Battle of Crécy, 1346 ; The Black Plague, 1348 ; Charles IV., Emperor, 1349 ; Battle of Poitiers, 1356 ; Treaty of Bretigny, 1360 ; Statute of Kilkenny, 1367 ; Death of Pedro the Cruel, 1369, of Edward III., 1377, and of Gregory XI. ; Great schism of the West, 1378 ; Wenceslaus, Emperor, 1378, deposed, 1400 ; John of Avisa, King of Portugal, 1383.

*Fifteenth Century.*

Battle of Angora, 1402 ; Death of Timur, or Tamerlane, 1405 ; Council of Pisa, 1409, of Constance, 1414 ; Battle of Agincourt, 1415 ; Election of Martin V., 1417 ; Death of Charles VI., King of France, 1422 ; Joan of Arc, 1429 ; Treaty of Arras, 1435 ; Council of Basle, 1431 ; End of the Hussite war, 1434 ; Death of the Emperor Sigismund, 1437 ; Ecumenical Council of Florence, 1439 ; Abdication of the last anti-pope, 1449 ; Taking of Constantinople by the Turks, 1453.

## LIST OF ROMAN PONTIFFS,

WITH BIRTHPLACE, DATES OF ACCESSION AND DEATH, AND LENGTH OF PONTIFICATE, AS IN THE BASILICA OF  
ST. PAUL, ROME.

NAME.	Date of Access- sion.	Date of Death.	Duration of Pontificate.		
	A.D.	A.D.	Y.	M.	D.
1. St. Peter, Native of Bethsaida in Galilee, Prince of the Apostles, who received from our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ the Su- preme Pontificate, to be transmitted to his successors; and, having resided for a time at Antioch, established his See at Rome, where he suffered martyrdom on the 29th of June, 67.....	..	..	25	2	7
2. St. Linus, Volterra, Mart.....	67	78	11	3	12
3. St. Cletus, Rome, Mart.....	78	90	12	1	11
4. St. Clement I., Rome, Mart.....	90	100	10	2	10
5. St. Anacletus, Greece, Mart.....	100	112	12	10	7
6. St. Evaristus, Syria, Mart.....	112	121	9	7	2
7. St. Alexander I., Rome, Mart.....	121	132	10	7	3
8. St. Sixtus I., Rome, Mart.....	132	142	9	3	21
9. St. Telesphorus, Greece, Mart.....	142	154	11	3	21
10. St. Hyginus, Greece, Mart.....	154	158	4	3	8
11. St. Pius I., Aquileia, Mart.....	158	167	8	3	3
12. St. Anicetus, Syria, Mart.....	167	175	8	4	20
13. St. Soter, Naples, Mart.....	175	182	7	3	21
14. St. Eleutherius, Epirus, Mart.....	182	193	11	4	5
15. St. Victor I., Africa, Mart.....	193	203	10	2	10
16. St. Zephyrinus, Rome, Mart.....	203	220	17	2	10
17. St. Calixtus I., Rome, Mart.....	221	227	5	2	10
18. St. Urban I., Rome, Mart.....	227	233	6	7	4
19. St. Pontian, Rome, Mart.....	233	238	5	2	2
20. St. Anterus, Greece, Mart.....	238	239	1	1	10
21. St. Fabian, Rome, Mart.....	240	253	13	1	10
22. St. Cornelius, Rome, Mart.....	254	255	1	10	0
23. St. Lucius I., Rome, Mart.....	255	257	1	4	12
24. St. Stephen I., Rome, Mart.....	257	260	3	3	20
25. St. Sixtus II., Greece, Mart.....	260	261	0	11	13
26. St. Dionysius, Turin.....	261	272	11	3	14
27. St. Felix I., Rome, Mart.....	272	275	2	5	25
28. St. Eutychian, Tuscany, Mart.....	275	283	8	10	3
29. St. Caius, Dalmatia, Mart.....	283	290	12	4	9
30. St. Marcellinus, Rome, Mart.....	296	304	7	11	3
31. St. Marcellus I., Rome, Mart.....	304	309	4	1	21
32. St. Eusebius, Calabria.....	309	311	2	1	25
33. St. Melchiades, Africa.....	311	314	3	7	7
34. St. Sylvester I., Rome.....	314	337	23	10	27
35. St. Marcus, Rome.....	337	340	2	8	21
36. St. Julius I., Rome.....	341	352	11	2	6
37. St. Liberius, Rome.....	352	363	10	7	3
38. St. Felix II., Rome.....	363	365	1	3	2
39. St. Damasus, Spain.....	366	384	18	2	10

NAME.	Date of Accession.	Date of Death.	Duration of Pontificate.
	A.D.	A.D.	Y. M. D.
40. St. Siricius, Rome.....	384	398	13 1 10
41. St. Anastasius I., Rome.....	399	402	2 10 6
42. St. Innocent I., Albano.....	402	417	15 2 20
43. St. Zozimus, Greece.....	417	418	1 9 9
44. St. Boniface I., Rome.....	418	423	4 9 23
45. St. Celestine I., Rome.....	423	432	9 10 9
46. St. Sixtus III., Rome.....	432	440	8 1 14
47. St. Leo I. (the Great), Tuscany.....	440	461	21 1 13
48. St. Hilary, Sardinia.....	461	468	6 3 10
49. St. Simplicius, Tivoli.....	468	483	15 0 6
50. St. Felix III., Rome.....	483	492	8 11 18
51. St. Gelasius I., Africa.....	492	496	4 8 18
52. St. Anastasius II., Rome.....	496	498	1 11 24
53. St. Symmachus, Rome.....	498	514	15 7 27
54. St. Hormisdas, Frosinone.....	514	523	9 0 11
55. St. John I., Tuscany, Mart.....	523	526	2 9 5
56. St. Felix IV., Benevento.....	526	530	4 2 13
57. Boniface II., Rome.....	530	532	2 0 26
58. John II., Rome.....	532	535	2 4 25
59. St. Agapitus, Rome.....	535	536	0 10 19
60. St. Silverius, Frosinone, Mart.....	536	538	2 0 12
61. Vigilius, Rome.....	538	555	16 0 0
62. Pelagius I., Rome.....	555	560	4 10 18
63. John III., Rome.....	560	573	12 11 26
64. Benedict I., Rome.....	574	578	4 1 28
65. Pelagius II., Rome.....	578	590	11 2 10
66. St. Gregory I. (the Great), Rome.....	590	604	13 6 10
67. Sabinianus, Volterra.....	604	606	1 5 9
68. Boniface III., Rome.....	607	607	0 8 22
69. St. Boniface IV., Marso.....	608	615	6 8 22
70. St. Adeodatus I., Rome.....	615	619	3 0 20
71. Boniface V., Naples.....	619	625	5 10 0
72. Honorius I., Capua.....	625	638	12 11 17
73. Severinus, Rome.....	640	640	0 2 4
74. John IV., Dalmatia.....	640	642	1 9 18
75. Theodorus I., Greece.....	642	649	6 5 19
76. St. Martin I., Todi, Mart.....	649	655	6 2 11
77. St. Eugenius I., Rome.....	655	656	1 7 14
78. St. Vitalian, Segni.....	657	672	14 5 29
79. Adeodatus II., Rome.....	672	676	4 2 5
80. Domnus I., Rome.....	676	678	1 2 10
81. St. Agatho, Greece.....	678	682	3 6 14
82. St. Leo II., Sicily.....	682	683	0 10 18
83. St. Benedict II., Rome.....	684	685	0 10 12
84. John V., Antioch.....	685	686	1 0 11
85. Conon, Thracia.....	686	687	0 11 0
86. St. Sergius I., Siculiana.....	687	701	13 8 22
87. John VI., Greece.....	701	705	3 2 12
88. John VII., Greece.....	705	707	2 7 17
89. Sisinnius, Syria.....	708	708	0 0 20
90. Constantine, Syria.....	708	715	7 0 15
91. St. Gregory II., Rome.....	715	731	15 8 23
92. St. Gregory III., Syria.....	731	741	10 8 20
93. St. Zacharias, Greece.....	741	752	10 3 14
94. Stephen II., Rome.....	752	752	0 0 3
95. Stephen III., Rome.....	752	757	5 0 29

NAME.	Date of Accession.	Date of Death.	Duration of Pontificate.
	A.D.	A.D.	Y. M. D.
96. St. Paul I., Rome.	757	767	10 1 0
97. Stephen IV., Syracuse.	768	771	3 5 27
98. Adrian I., Rome.	771	795	23 10 17
99. St. Leo III., Rome.	795	816	20 5 16
100. Stephen V., Rome.	816	817	0 7 0
101. St. Paschal I., Rome.	817	824	7 0 17
102. Eugenius II., Rome.	824	827	3 6 0
103. Valentine, Rome.	827	827	0 1 10
104. Gregory IV., Rome.	827	844	16 0 0
105. Sergius II., Rome.	844	847	2 11 26
106. St. Leo IV., Rome.	847	855	8 3 6
107. Benedict III., Rome.	855	853	2 6 10
108. St. Nicholas I. (the Great), Rome.	858	867	9 6 20
109. Adrian II., Rome.	867	872	4 10 15
110. John VIII., Rome.	872	882	10 0 1
111. Marinus I., Gallicia.	882	884	1 5 0
112. Adrian III., Rome.	884	885	1 4 0
113. Stephen VI., Rome.	885	891	6 0 9
114. Formosus, Ostia.	891	896	4 6 0
115. Boniface VI.	896	896	0 0 15
116. Stephen VII., Rome.	897	893	1 2 0
117. Romanus, Gallese.	893	898	0 3 21
118. Theodorus II., Rome.	898	898	0 0 20
119. John IX., Tivoli.	898	900	2 0 15
120. Benedict IV., Rome.	900	903	3 2 0
121. Leo V., Ardea.	903	903	0 1 26
122. Christophorus, Rome.	903	904	0 6 0
123. Sergius III., Rome.	904	911	7 3 0
124. Anastasius III., Rome.	911	913	2 2 0
125. Landus, Sabina.	913	914	0 6 10
126. John X., Ravenna.	915	923	14 2 3
127. Leo VI., Rome.	928	929	0 3 5
128. Stephen VIII., Rome.	929	931	2 1 12
129. John XI., Rome.	931	936	4 10 0
130. Leo VII., Rome.	936	939	3 6 10
131. Stephen IX., Rome.	939	942	3 4 5
132. Marinus II., Rome.	943	946	3 6 13
133. Agapitus II., Rome.	946	956	10 3 0
134. John XII., Rome.	956	964	7 9 0
135. Benedict V., Rome.	964	965	1 1 12
136. John XIII., Rome.	965	972	6 11 5
137. Benedict VI., Rome.	972	973	1 3 0
138. Domnus II., Rome.	973	973	0 3 0
139. Benedict VII., Rome.	975	984	9 5 0
140. John XIV., Pavia.	984	985	0 8 10
141. Boniface VII., France.	985	985	0 7 15
142. John XV., Rome.	985	996	10 4 12
143. John XVI.	990	996	0 4 12
144. Gregory V., Germany.	996	999	2 8 0
145. John XVII.	999	999	0 10 0
146. Sylvester II., France.	999	1003	4 1 9
147. John XVIII., Rome.	1003	1003	0 4 25
148. John XIX., Rome.	1003	1009	5 7 23
149. Sergius IV., Rome.	1009	1012	2 8 13
150. Benedict VIII., Rome.	1012	1024	11 11 11
151. John XX., Rome.	1024	1033	9 8 8

NAME.	Date of Accession.	Date of Death.	Duration of Pontificate.
	A.D.	A.D.	Y. M. D.
152. Benedict IX., Rome.....	1033	1044	11 0 0
153. Gregory VI., Rome (abdicated in 1046).....	1044	....	2 8 0
154. Clement II., Saxony.....	1046	1047	0 9 15
155. Damasus II., Bavaria.....	1048	1048	0 0 23
156. St. Leo IX., Germany.....	1049	1054	5 7 7
157. Victor II., Svevia.....	1055	1057	2 3 15
158. Stephen X., Germany.....	1057	1058	0 7 27
159. Benedict X.....	1058	....	0 9 20
160. Nicholas II., France.....	1059	1061	2 6 25
161. Alexander II., Milan.....	1061	1073	11 6 21
162. St. Gregory VII., Soana .....	1073	1085	12 1 3
163. Victor III., Benevento.....	1087	1087	0 4 26
164. Urban II., Reims.....	1088	1099	11 4 18
165. Paschal II., Tuscany.....	1099	1118	18 5 7
166. Gelasius II., Gaeta .....	1118	1119	1 0 4
167. Calixtus II., Burgundy.....	1119	1124	5 10 12
168. Honorius II., Bologna.....	1124	1130	5 1 25
169. Innocent II., Rome.....	1130	1143	13 8 9
170. Celestine II., Citta di Castello.....	1143	1144	0 5 13
171. Lucius II., Bologna.....	1144	1145	0 11 14
172. B. Eugenius III., Montemagno.....	1145	1153	8 4 10
173. Anastasius IV., Rome.....	1153	1154	1 4 24
174. Adrian IV., England.....	1154	1159	4 8 29
175. Alexander III., Siena.....	1159	1181	21 11 22
176. Lucius III., Lucca.....	1181	1185	4 2 18
177. Urban III., Milan.....	1185	1187	1 10 25
178. Gregory VIII., Benevento.....	1187	1187	0 1 27
179. Clement III., Rome.....	1187	1191	3 3 8
180. Celestine III., Rome.....	1191	1198	6 9 9
181. Innocent III., Anagni.....	1198	1216	18 6 9
182. Honorius III., Rome .....	1216	1227	10 8 0
183. Gregory IX., Anagni.....	1227	1241	14 5 2
184. Celestine IV., Milan.....	1241	1241	0 0 17
185. Innocent IV., Genoa.....	1243	1254	11 5 14
186. Alexander IV., Anagni.....	1254	1261	6 5 13
187. Urban IV., Troyes.....	1261	1264	3 1 4
188. Clement IV., France.....	1265	1269	3 9 0
189. B. Gregory X., Piacenza.....	1271	1276	4 4 10
190. Innocent V., Savoy.....	1276	1276	0 5 2
191. Adrian V., Genoa.....	1276	1276	0 1 9
192. John XXI., Lisbon.....	1276	1277	0 8 5
193. Nicholas III., Rome.....	1277	1280	2 8 29
194. Martin IV., France.....	1281	1285	4 1 7
195. Honorius IV., Rome .....	1285	1287	2 0 1
196. Nicholas IV., Ascoli.....	1288	1292	4 1 14
197. St. Celestine V., Lavoro (resigned).....	1294	....	0 5 8
198. Boniface VIII., Anagni.....	1294	1303	8 9 13
199. B. Benedict XI., Treviso.....	1303	1304	0 8 5
200. Clement V., Fr. (removed to Avignon).....	1305	1314	8 10 15
201. John XXII., France.....	1316	1334	18 3 28
202. Benedict XII., France.....	1334	1342	7 4 7
203. Clement VI., France.....	1342	1352	10 6 28
204. Innocent VI., France.....	1352	1362	9 8 25
205. B. Urban V., France.....	1362	1370	8 1 22
206. Gregory XI., Fr. (restored See to Rome).....	1370	1378	7 2 28

## THE GREAT SCHISM OF THE WEST.

*Popes Sitting at Rome.*

Urban VI. elected.....	1378	<i>Popes Sitting at Avignon.</i>
Boniface IX.....	1389	Clement VII. (Robert of Geneva) elected.....
Innocent VII.....	1404	1378
Gregory XII.....	1406	Benedict XIII. (Peter de Luna). 1394

*Popes Sitting at Bologna.*

Alexander V.....	1409-1410	John XXIII.....	1410-1415
------------------	-----------	-----------------	-----------

## AFTER THE GREAT SCHISM.

Martin V.....	1417-1431	<i>Felix V.</i> , anti-pope.....	1439-1449
Eugenius IV.....	1431-1447	Nicholas V.....	1447-1455

## LIST OF MONARCHS.

*Emperors of the West after Theodosius the Great.*

Honorius.....	395-423	Anthemius .....	467-472
Valentinian III.....	424-455	Olybrius.....	472-472
Petronius Maximus.....	455-455	Interregnum.	
Avitus.....	455-456	Glycerius .....	474
Interregnum.		Julius Nepos .....	474-475
Majorian.....	457-461	Romulus Augustulus .....	475-476
Severus II.....	461-465		
Interregnum of more than a year.		<i>Kingdom of the Heruli.</i>	
		Odoacer.....	476-493

*Ostrogoth Kings of Italy.*

Theodoric.....	493-526	Theodebald .....	540-541
Athalaric.....	526-534	Alaric .....	541-541
Theodosius.....	534-536	Totila .....	541-552
Vitiges....	536-540	Teias.....	552-554

*Kings of the Lombards.*

Alboin .....	558-573	Garibald .....	671-671
Cleph .....	573-574	Pertharites .....	671-686
Interregnum of ten years.		Cunibert the Pious.....	686-700
Autharis .....	584-590	Luitper, eight months.....	700-701
Agilulf .....	591-615	Regilbert .....	701-701
Adaloald .....	615-625	Aribert .....	701-712
Ariovald .....	625-636	Luitprand .....	712-744
Rotharis.....	626-652	Hildebrand with Luitprand..	744-744
Rodoald.....	652-653	Rachis .....	744-749
Arribert.....	653-661	Astulf .....	749-756
Godebert.....	661-662	Didier.....	756-774
Grimoald.....	662-671		

*Vandal Kings in Africa.*

Genseric.....	428-477	Trasamund .....	496-523
Huneric .....	477-484	Hilderic .....	523-530
Gunthamund.....	484-496	Gelimer .....	530-534

*Byzantine Emperors.*

Arcadius.....	395-408	Michael III., the Drunkard.	842-867
Theodosius II.....	408-450	Basil the Macedonian.....	867-886
Marcian.....	450-457	Leo the Philosopher.....	886-911
Leo I.....	457-474	Alexander.....	911-912
Leo II., the Younger.....	474-474	Constantine VI., Porphyro-	
Zeno.....	474-491	genitus.....	
Basiliscus.....	474-491	Romanus Lecapenus.....	
Marcian.....	474-491	Christopher.....	913
Leontius.....	474-491	Stephen.....	
Anastasius I.....	491-518	Constantine VII.....	
Justin I.....	518-527	Constantine, alone.....	948-959
Justinian I.....	527-565	Romanus II.....	959-963
Justin II.....	565-578	Nicephorus Phocas.....	963-969
Tiberius II.....	578-582	John Zimisces.....	969-976
Maurice.....	582-602	Basil II.....	963-1025
Phocas.....	602-610	Constantine VIII.....	1025-1028
Heraclius.....	640-641	Romanus Argyrus.....	1028-1034
Heraclius Constantine, three months.....	641-641	Michael IV.....	1034-1041
Heracleon, seven months.....	641-641	Michael Calaphates.....	1041-1042
Tiberius, a few days.....	641-641	Zoe and Theodora, sisters, two months.....	1042-1042
Constans II.....	641-668	Constantine Monomachus.....	1042-1054
Constantine III., Pogonatus.....	668-685	Theodora.....	1054-1056
Justinian II.....	685-695	Michael Stratoticus.....	1056-1057
Leontius.....	695-698	Isaac Comnenus.....	1057-1059
Absimarus Tiberius.....	698-705	Constantine X., Ducas.....	1059-1067
Justinian II. restored.....	705-711	Michael Andronicus and Constantine Ducas, brothers.....	1067-1068
Philippicus-Bardanes.....	711-713	Romanus Diogenes.....	1068-1071
Anastasius II.....	713-715	Michael Ducas, alone.....	1071-1078
Theodosius III.....	716-717	Nicephorus Botaniates.....	1078-1081
Leo III., Isauricus.....	717-741	Alexis Comnenus.....	1081-1118
Constantine V., Copronymus.....	741-775	John Comnenus.....	1118-1143
Leo IV.....	775-780	Manuel Comnenus.....	1143-1180
Constantine VI. and Irene.....	780-797	Alexis Comnenus.....	1180-1183
Irene, alone.....	797-802	Andronicus Comnenus.....	1183-1185
Nicephorus.....	802-811	Isaac Angelus.....	1185-1195
Stauracius.....	811-811	Alexis Angelus Comnenus.....	1195-1203
Michael Rhangabes.....	811-813	Alexis Ducas Murzuphlus.....	1203-1204
Leo the Armenian.....	813-820		
Michael the Stammerer.....	820-829		
Theophilus.....	829-842		

*Latin Emperors of Constantinople.*

Baldwin.....	1204-1206	Robert de Courtenay .....	1221-1228
Henry, his brother.....	1206-1216	Baldwin II., de Courtenay.	1228-1261
Peter de Courtenay.....	1216-1218		

*Greek Emperors at Nicæa.*

Theodore Lascaris I.....	1204-1222	John Lascaris and Michael	
John Ducas Vatatzes.....	1222-1225	Palaeologus .....	1259-1261
Theodore Lascaris II.....	1255-1259		

*Greek Emperors after the return to Constantinople.*

Michael Palaeologus .....	1261-1282	John Cantacuzenus abdi-	
Andronicus the Elder.....	1282-1332	cates.....	1355
Andronicus the Lounger.....	1332-1341	Mannel Palaeologus.....	1391-1424
John Palaeologus and John Cantacuzenus .....	1341-1391	John Palaeologus II.....	1424-1448
		Constantine Palaeologus.....	1448-1453

*Kings of Jerusalem.*

Godfrey of Bouillon.....	1099-1100	Baldwin IV., the Leper.....	1173-1185
Baldwin I.....	1100-1118	Baldwin V.....	1185-1186
Baldwin II. du Bourcq.....	1118-1131	Guy of Lusignan.....	1186-1193
Fulk.....	1131-1144	Henry of Champagne.....	1192-1197
Baldwin III.....	1144-1162	Amaury II. of Lusignan.....	1197-1205
Amaury I.....	1162-1173	John of Brienne.....	1210-1237

*Kings of France.**Merovingians.*

Pharamond (?).....	420-427
Clodion.....	427-448
Meroveaus.....	448-458
Childeric.....	458-481
Clovis I., the Great.....	481-511
Thierry, King of Metz.....	511-534
Clodomir.....	511-524
Childebert.....	511-558
Clotaire I.....	561-561
Caribert.....	561-567
Gontran.....	561-592
Chilperic I.....	561-584
Sigebert.....	561-575
Clotaire.....	584-628
Dagobert I.....	628-638
Clovis II.....	638-656
Clotaire III.....	656-670
Childeric II.....	670-673
Thierry III.....	673-691
Clovis III.....	691-695
Childebert III.....	695-711
Dagobert II.....	711-715
Chilperic II.....	716-720
Thierry IV.....	
Interregnum of five years.....	
Childeric III.....	742-752

*Carlovingians.*

Pepin the Short.....	752-768
Charlemagne.....	768-814
Louis I., the Débonnaire.....	814-840
Charles II., the Bald.....	840-877
Louis II., the Stammerer.....	877-879

Louis III.....	880-882
Carloman.....	880-884
Charles the Fat.....	884-887
Eudes.....	887-898
Charles the Simple.....	893-929
Robert.....	922-928
Raoul.....	923-936
Louis IV., d'Outremer.....	936-954
Lothaire.....	954-986
Louis V., the Idler.....	986-987

*Capetians.*

Hugh Capet.....	987-996
Robert.....	996-1031
Henry I.....	1031-1060
Philip I.....	1060-1108
Louis V., the Fat.....	1108-1137
Louis VII., the Young.....	1137-1180
Philip II., Augustus.....	1180-1223
Louis VIII., the Lion.....	1223-1226
Louis IX., the Saint.....	1226-1270
Philip III., the Bold.....	1270-1285
Louis X., le Hutin.....	1314-1316
Interregnum of five months.....	
John I., eight days.....	
Philip V., the Long.....	1316-1322
Charles IV., the Fair.....	1322-1328
Philip VI., of Valois.....	1328-1350
John II., the Good.....	1350-1364
Charles V., the Wise.....	1364-1380
Charles VI., the Well-beloved.....	1380-1422
Charles VII., the Victorious.....	1422-1461

*Kings of England.**Anglo-Saxon Line.*

Egbert, King of all England.....	827-837
Ethelwolf.....	837-858
Ethelbald.....	858-860
Ethelbert.....	860-866
Etherelred I.....	866-871
Alfred the Great.....	871-900
Edward I.....	900-924
Athelstan.....	924-940
Edmund I.....	940-946
Edred.....	946-955
Edwy.....	955-959
Edgard.....	959-975
Edward II., the Martyr.....	975-978
Ethelred II.....	978-1013

Sweyn.....	1013-1015
Edmund II.....	1016-1017
Canute the Great.....	1015-1037
Harold I.....	1037-1040
Hardicanute.....	1040-1042
Edward III., the Confessor.....	1042-1056
Harold.....	1056-1066

*Norman Line.*

William I., the Conqueror.....	1066-1087
William II., Rufus.....	1087-1100
Henry I., Beauclerc.....	1100-1135
Stephen of Blois.....	1135-1154
Henry II., Plantagenet.....	1154-1189
Richard I., Cœur de Lion.....	1189-1190
John Lackland.....	1199-1216
Henry III.....	1216-1272

*Kings of England—Continued.*

Edward I., Longshanks.....	1272-1307	<i>House of Lancaster.</i>
Edward II. of Caernarvon.....	1307-1327	Henry IV. of Lancaster..... 1399-1413
Edward III. of Windsor.....	1327-1377	Henry V..... 1413-1422
Richard II. of Bordeaux.....	1377-1399	Henry VI..... 1422-1461

*Emperors of the West, or of Germany.*

Charlemagne.....	800-814	Frederick I., Barbarossa..... 1152-1190
Louis le Débonnaire.....	814-840	Henry VI..... 1190-1197
Lothaire I.....	840-855	Philip..... 1198-1208
Louis II.....	855-875	Otho IV..... 1198-1218
Charles the Bald.....	875-877	Frederick II..... 1212-1250
Interregnum of three years.		Conrad IV..... 1250-1254
Charles the Fat.....	881-888	William..... 1254-1256
Gui of Spoleto.....	889-894	The long interregnum un-
Lambert.....	891-896	til..... 1273
Arnulf.....	896-899	Rudolph of Hapsburg..... 1273-1291
Louis III.....	899-905	Adolph of Nassau..... 1292-1298
Berenger.....	905-924	Albert of Austria..... 1298-1308
Conrad I., king.....	911-918	Henry VII. of Luxem-
Henry the Fowler, king.....	918-936	bourg..... 1308-1313
Otho the Great.....	936-973	Louis of Bavaria..... 1314-1347
Otho II.....	973-983	Charles IV..... 1347-1378
Otho III.....	983-1002	Wenceslaus..... 1378-1400
Henry II., the Saint.....	1002-1024	Robert, Palatine of the
Conrad II., the Salic.....	1024-1039	Rhine..... 1400-1410
Henry III., the Black.....	1039-1056	Josse of Moravia, four
Henry IV.....	1056-1106	months..... 1410-1410
Henry V.....	1106-1125	Sigismund..... 1410-1437
Lothaire II.....	1125-1137	Albert II. of Austria..... 1438-1439
Conrad III.....	1138-1152	Frederick III..... 1440-1493

*Caliphs of the East.*

Mohammed.....	622-632	Mutawakel.....	847-861
Abu Bekir.....	632-634	Mustanser.....	861-862
Omar.....	634-644	Mustam-Billah.....	862-866
Othman.....	644-656	Mutaz.....	866-869
Ali.....	656-661	Al-Muhtadi-Billah.....	869-870
Hassan.....	661-661	Muhtamed-Billah.....	870-892
Moaviah, alone.....	661-680	Muhtaded-Billah.....	892-902
Yesid I.....	680-683	Al-Muktafi-Billah.....	902-908
Moaviah II.....	683-684	Al-Muktader-Billah.....	908-932
Merwan I.....	684-685	Kaher.....	932-934
Abd-el-Melck.....	685-705	Rhadi.....	934-940
Walid I.....	705-715	Muhtaki.....	940-944
Soliman.....	715-717	Mustakfi.....	944-946
Omar II.....	717-720	Muthi.....	946-974
Yesid II.....	720-724	Thai.....	974-991
Hesham.....	724-743	Kader.....	991-1031
Walid II.....	743-744	Kaim-Bamrillah.....	1031-1075
Yesid III.....	744-744	Muk'tadi-Bamrillah.....	1075-1094
Ibrahim.....	744-744	Mustadher.....	1094-1118
Merwan II.....	744-750	Mustarshed.....	1118-1134
Abul-Abbas.....	750-754	Rasheld.....	1134-1136
Abu-Jaafar Al-Mansur.....	754-755	Al-Muktafi II.....	1136-1160
Mohammed Mahadi.....	775-784	Mustanjud.....	1160-1170
Hadi.....	784-786	Mustadi.....	1170-1180
Harun-al Rashid.....	786-809	Nasser.....	1180-1225
Amin.....	809-813	Daher.....	1225-1226
Al-Mamun.....	813-833	Mustanser.....	1226-1243
Motassem.....	833-842	Mustazem.....	1243-1258
Vathek-Billah.....	842-847	The Sultans replace the Caliphs.	

*Sultans of the Ottoman Turks.*

Togru Beg, Othman or Osman, Founder of the Empire	1299-1326	Soliman I.....	1402-1410
Orkhan.....	1326-1360	Musa Shelebi.....	1410-1413
Amurat I.....	1360-1389	Mohammed I.....	1413-1421
Bayazid (Bajazet) I.....	1389-1402	Amurat II.....	1421-1451
		Mohammed II.....	1451-1481

*Sultans of Egypt.*

Nur-ed-Din Mahmoud.....	1145-1173	Shajeredhur.....	1250-1250
Saladin.....	1173-1193	Ibeg, five days.....	1250-1250
Malek-el-Aziz.....	1193-1198	Malek-el-Asraf Musa.....	1250-1251
Malek-el-Mansur.....	1198-1200	Azzed-Din-Moez-Ibeg.....	1254-1257
Safadin.....	1200-1218	Mur-ed-Din Ali.....	1257-1259
Malek-el-Kamel.....	1218-1238	Kutuz.....	1259-1260
Malek-Adel.....	1238-1240	Bibars Bondokhars.....	1260-1277
Malek-Saleh.....	1240-1249	Kelaün.....	1277-1290
Malek-el-Moadham.....	1249-1250	Shatil.....	1290

*Visigoth Kings of Spain.*

Euric.....	465-484	Sisebut.....	612-620
Alaric.....	484-507	Recared II.....	620-621
Theodosic the Great.....	507-526	Suintilla.....	621-631
Amalaric.....	526-531	Sisenand.....	631-636
Theudis.....	531-543	Chintila.....	636-640
Theudisel.....	548-549	Tulga, or Fulga.....	640-642
Agila.....	550-554	Chindasvind.....	642-653
Athanagild.....	554-567	Receswind.....	653-673
Liuva.....	567-572	Wamba.....	672-680
Leovigild.....	572-586	Ervig.....	680-687
Recared I.....	586-601	Egiza.....	687-701
Liuva II.....	601-603	Vitiza.....	701-710
Vitheric.....	603-612	Roderic.....	710-712
Gontmart.....	610-610		

## CHRISTIAN KINGDOMS OF SPAIN.

*Kings of Leon and of the Asturias.*

Pelagius (Pelayo).....	718-737	Garcias.....	910-913
Favila.....	737-739	Ordoño II.....	914-923
Alfonso I., the Catholic.....	739-757	Froila II.....	923-924
Froila I.....	757-768	Alfonso IV.....	924-927
Aurclio.....	768-774	Ramiro II.....	927-950
Silo.....	774-783	Ordoño III.....	950-955
Mauregat.....	783-788	Sancho I., the Great.....	955-967
Bermudo.....	788-791	Ramiro III.....	967-982
Alfonso II., the Chaste.....	791-840	Bermudo II.....	982-999
Ramiro I.....	842-852	Alfonso V.....	999-1027
Ordoño.....	850-866	Bermudo III.....	1027-1037
Alfonso III., the Great.....	866-910		

*Kings of Castile.*

(Castile erected a kingdom in 1033.)

Ferdinand I.....	1037-1065	Ferdinand II.....	1158-1158
Sancho II.....	1065-1073	Alfonso IX., the Good.....	1158-1214
Alfonso VI.....	1072-1109	Henry I.....	1214-1217
Urraca and Alfonso VII.....	1109-1126	St. Ferdinand III.....	1217-1252
Alfonso VIII.....	1126-1157	Alfonso X., the Wise.....	1252-1284
Sancho III.....	1157-1158	Sancho IV.....	1284-1295

*Kings of Castile—Continued.*

Ferdinand IV.....	1295-1312	Juan II.....	1406-1454
Alfonso XI.....	1312-1350	Henry IV.....	1454-1474
Pedro the Cruel.....	1350-1368	Isabella marries Ferdinand	
Henry II.....	1368-1379	V. of Aragon, and the two	
Juan I.....	1379-1380	kingdoms are thus united,	1474
Henry III.....	1390-1406		

*Kings of Aragon.*

Ramiro.....	1035-1063	Alfonso III.....	1285-1291
Sancho Ramirez.....	1063-1094	James II.....	1291-1327
Pedro I.....	1094-1104	Alfonso IV.....	1327-1336
Alfonso I.....	1104-1134	Pedro IV.....	1336-1387
Ramiro II.....	1134-1137	Juan I.....	1387-1395
Doña Petronilla and Raymond Berenger.....	1137-1162	Martin.....	1395-1410
Alfonso II.....	1162-1196	Ferdinand IV., the Just.....	1412-1416
Pedro II.....	1196-1213	Alfonso V.....	1416-1458
James the Conqueror.....	1213-1276	Juan II.....	1458-1479
Pedro III.....	1276-1285	Ferdinand V.....	1479-1516
		Union of Castile and Aragon.	

*Kings of Naples.*

Roger.....	1137-1154	Manfred.....	1258-1266
William I., the Bad.....	1154-1166	Charles of Anjou.....	1266-1285
William II., the Good.....	1166-1189	Charles II.....	1285-1309
Tancred.....	1188-1194	Robert the Wise.....	1309-1343
William III.....	1194-1194	Joanna I.....	1343-1382
Constance and Henry.....	1194-1197	Charles III.....	1382-1386
Frederick.....	1197-1197	Ladislaus.....	1386-1414
Conrad I.....	1250-1254	Joanna II.....	1414-1435
Conradin.....	1254-1258	Alfonso of Aragon.....	1435-1458



Catholic Histories for Catholic Schools

---

THE YOUNG CATHOLIC'S  
Series of Histories.

---

---

**ANCIENT HISTORY.**

Adapted from the French of Fr. Gazeau, S.J.

---

**ROMAN HISTORY.**

Adapted from the French of Fr. Gazeau, S.J.

---

**HISTORY OF THE MIDDLE AGES.**

Adapted from the French of Fr. Gazeau, S.J.

---

**MODERN HISTORY.**

Adapted from the French of Fr. Gazeau, S.J. [In press.]

---

**HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.**

By J. R. G. Hassard. With Introduction by Bp. Spalding.

---

**INTRODUCTORY HISTORY OF THE  
UNITED STATES.**

On the Catechetical Plan.

---

*Special Terms for Introduction.*

---

**The Catholic Publication Co.,**

9 Barclay Street, New York.

11 19179-2











LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 018 458 750 6